Mr. BLOUNT's Oracles of Reason,

Examined and Answered,

In Nine SECTIONS

IN WHICH

His many *Heterodox* Opinions are Refuted, the Holy Scriptures and Revealed Religion are Asserted,

AGAINST

Deism & Atheism.

By *JOSIAH KING*, M. A.
And Chaplain to the Right Honourable
JAMES Earl of *ANGLESEY*.

EXON:
Printed by *S. Darker* for *Ch. Yeo*, *J. Pearce* and *Ph. Bishop*, Booksellers in *Exon*, and are to be sold by the Booksellers of *London* and *Westminster*. 1698.

TRINITY COLLEGE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

To the Right Reverend Father in God,

JONATHAN,

Lord Biſhop of *Exon.*

May it pleaſe your Lordſhip,

I Have been for ſome time in debate with my ſelf, whether I ſhould preſume to prefix your Lordſhip's Great Name before this Treatiſe. That which at laſt weighed down the Scales with me, was that of Varius Geminus *in* Seneca.

Cæſar qui apud te audent dicere, magnitudinem tuam ignorant, qui non audent Humanitatem.

The principle Motive which I had for Publiſhing the ſame under your Lordſhip's Name and Protection, (beſides the Teſtification of my bounden Duty, as being a Presbyter of your Dioceſs) owes its Original to your Lordſhip's great Zeal for the Truth; and your great Averſion from thoſe monſtrous and Atheiſtical Opinions, which are now ſo common among us.

Neither can I in the leaſt doubt of your Lordſhip's gracious Acceptance; provided that the Matter contained in the Book, makes good (as I hope it doth) its Title.

What other Motives I might truly have, with Reſpect to your Lordſhip's good Government, and the great Happineſs that we of your Clergy enjoy under the ſame (as things generally known) I willingly pretermit, leaſt I may ſeem too prolix and troubleſome. That excellent Saying of Lipſius, *having made a deep Impreſſion on my Mind:* Breves Sermones apud Dæum ſæpe, apud magnos viros ſemper grati & accepti ſunt.

May it Pleaſe your Lordſhip,

I am,
Your moſt Humble,
And moſt Obedient Servant,

JOSIAH KING.

A PREFACE TO THE Reader.

ABout three or four Years ſince, when theſe Oracles of Reaſon appeared in the World, and made ſo great a Noiſe, I were deſired by a Miniſter in the Dioceſs of *Exon*, to read them; and to conceive in Writing, what I thought moſt blamable in them: which Requeſt I complied with; not intending then to be concerned with this Controverſie in publick; a-

all will believe that know the constant Avocations of a Parochial Charge.

Neither did I then doubt, but that a set, and formal Answer, would long ago have been made to Mr. *Blount*'s Book, but it proves otherwise: upon which account I were desired, upon an accidental Discourse, to publish this my Answer, which I have now done; not with a design to answer every thing in the Book, but to answer the greatest, and most remarkable Difficulties; and to obviate the principal Design of the Author, in opposing revealed Religion.

Pliny observes in the Dedication of his natural History to *Vespasian*, that the Greeks were wont to inscribe their Books with the Titles of the Muses, Honeycombs, the Horn of *Amatthea*, *Pandects*, and the like vain Titles, to insinuate with the Reader. The same course Mr. *Blount* hath taken, who calls his Book, *The Oracles of Reason*: but it is not the Title I am offended with; he subverts the Title himself, when *p.* 87. he says, *That humane Reason is like a Pitcher with two Ears, and that it may be taken on either side.*

That

That which gives Offence, is the Impiety contained in it; as, when *p.* 17. he ſays, *'Tis evident that the Five Books of* Moſes *were written by another Hand after his deceaſe.* And *p.* 58. *That he can evince from ſacred Oracles, that the fall of Angels was before the Creation of the World.* And *p.* 89. *That a Mediator derogates as much from the Mercy of God, as an Image doth from his Spirituality.* And *p.* 162. *That they were mean Perſons that call'd our Lord the Son of* David; *and that it was the Mob who cried Hoſanna, when he made his Cavalcade upon an Aſinego.* And many the like Expreſſions, which are to be treated of in their places.

If he uſes our Lord thus, we of the Clergy can expect no other Treatment from him; to whom he objects ſo much Ignorance, and nick-names us *Quicunq;* Men, and Canonical Gameſters, *p* 97. and 136.,

I do not deſign to trouble my Reader with a long Ppeface; wherefore I ſhall briefly acquaint him what I have performed in this Book, which I have di-

vided into Nine Sections for Methods ſake, and to avoid that Confuſion Mr. *Blount* is guilty of, as his book ſufficiently proves.

The firſt Section is of the *Moſaic* Hiſtory, and Divine Miracles; where I have manifeſted his Vanity, in appealing to the Teſtimony of the Fathers; and have defended the Divine Miracles from his ſubtile Objections, and ſly Inſinuations. Mr. *Blount* is a true Follower of the Author of the *Preadamites*; who makes uſe of this Method for weakning the Authority of the Scripture; and ſuggeſts his Difficulties without a flat denial, that his Reader may be enſnared unawares. I have alſo ſtated the *Moſaic* Year, a thing of no common Obſervation, and of good Uſe in theſe Controverſies, and proved it to be a perfect ſoler Year.

The ſecond Section is of Paradiſe; in which I have defended the literal Senſe, and diſcovered his miſtaking the Queſtion; and his fathering on *Moſes* (*p.* 36) that

that which he never writ, viz. That four Rivers proceeded from one and the ſame Fountain-head in *Eden*: Where is alſo diſcovered the Falſhood of *Celſus* and our Deiſts, concerning the ancient Jewiſh and Chriſtian Interpreters of *Geneſis*.

The third Section is of the Original of things; in which the difficulty concerning the Creation of Angels is diſcuſſed; as alſo their Corporiety; which (*p.* 59.) he falſly declares to be the Opinion of the Catholick Church. We have alſo ſhown, that ſome Particulars are omitted in the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation, and the Reaſon thereof; from whence Mr. *Blount* can receive no Advantage. Laſtly we have ſubjoyned an Apology for St. *Auſtin*'s Error.

The fourth Section is of the modern *Brachmins*; in which we ſhow how difficult it is to comprehend his Deſign; that his Arguments are of little Force. And his contradiction in ſaying (*p.* 87.) that *Deiſm* is a good manuring of a Man's Con-

Conſcience, if ſorted with Chriſtianity.

The fifth Section concerns the *Deiſt*'s Religion. We have made it evident how uncertain this Natutal Religion is by the Practice of Nations. And that what he adds of the Imitation of God, deſtroys his own Suppoſition. We have referred the Rewards and Puniſhments of another Life to be conſidered in another Section. And whereas he takes it for granted, that the *Deiſt* is no Idolater, we have proved the contrary: and that the ſame reaſon which exempts the *Deiſts* from that imputation, will exempt *Romaniſts*, *Reform'd*, *Socinian*, *Mahometan*, &c.

The ſixth Section concerns the *Arians*, *Trinitarians*, and *Councils*. In this Section it will appear how perverſe he repreſents the Affairs of thoſe times. *P.* 98. He makes the *Arians* to be Mounters of *Conſtantine* to the Throne; although if they had then a being, yet they made no Figure in the World. He fully tells us, that the *Arians* appealed for tryal

to

to the Fathers; that they were condemned at *Nice* by a Party, and by the Artifice of the Emperor. Where he alſo gives us a monſtrous Account of the Number of the Biſhops there aſſembled. And *p.* 99. he affirms, that the *Arians* had not Freedome to diſpute their Cauſe. He repreſents the *Arian* Councils of *Ariminum* very Erroneouſly, He manifeſts his Malignity when he accuſes the *Trinitarians* of Ignorance; and for Proof, cites a Canon of the Church; and *p* 103. he gives many Inſtances of the ſame: where we have proved that there is no ſuch Canon, as far as a Negative is capable of being proved. And we have diſcovered his diſingenuity in not mentioning *Du Ranckin*, from whom he borrowed all his Materials; word for word.

The ſeventh Section, is of the Immortality of the ſoul, and of the Original of the *Jews*. In this Section, the neceſſity of revealed Religion is proved from the inſufficiency of Philoſophical Reaſons to this purpoſe. As alſo with re-

lation

lation to a future State. Which, as Mr. *Blount* confeſſes, *p.* 118. hath ſo much ruffled and entangled mens Minds. The principal philoſophic Reaſon is examined and refell'd: From whence it will be evident, that the Scriptures alone give a ſatisfactory Account of thoſe things. Sir *Henry Savil*'s tranſlating *Tacitus*, and omitting the Original of the *Jews*, is here defended. Inſtitution of Divine Worſhip, proved to be before *Moſes* and *Abraham*: As alſo, that *Moſes* and the *Iſraelites* did not learn Circumciſion from the *Ægyptians*; and that our Author in this Method, followed *Celſus* and *Julian*.

The eighth Section; of marrying two Siſters, *Judaiſm*, *Chriſtianity*, *Millenaries*. In which, the Scriptures brought to prove it unlawful are defended. The Nature of Penal Laws in this caſe, makes more againſt our *Deiſts*, then for him; his Error proceeds from neglecting the *Hebrew*, and following the *Greek* Tranſlation. The Apoſtolic Canon in this caſe conſidered; Dr. *Hammond*'s Miſtake diſcovered, about a Woman's leaving her Husband, and marrying

rying again. As alſo, Mr. *Blount*'s Abuſe of the Council of *Eliberis*; where we are neceſſitated to ſpeak on ſomething concerning Excommunication, the Churches great Cenſure. *Grotius*, his Error in his Inference from the Apoſtolic Canon, reproved; and his Collection from the Council of *Eliberis*, proved unwarrantable. St. *Baſil*'s Epiſtle to *Diadorus* in this caſe, is conſidered: Mr. *Blount*'s great Falſhood and Abuſe of the civil Law in this caſe, is laid open; the Sects of the *Jews*, and the caſe of the *Meſſiah*, is rightly ſtated; Mr. *Blount*'s manner of Arguing is reprehended. We have defended the Prophecy of *Daniel* in this caſe; and have ſhown the Original of the *Millinaries*.

The ninth Section; of *Augury*, Origine of Good and Evil, plurality of Worlds, *Ocellus Lucanus*, &c.

From his account of *Augury*, I have collected the Neceſſity of revealed Religion; diſcovered his miſtake of Chriſtian Proceſſions. If what *Varenius*, concerning whole Nations being Atheiſtical, affirms, be true, the moſt learned Dr. *Stilling fleet* ſeems to be

be under ſome miſtake. *Varenius*, his Aſſertion argues the Neceſſity of revealed Religion; the *Chinenſian* and *Ægyptian* account of time, proved to be vain and ridiculous; as alſo, the *Chaldean*, the main Props of our Author's Hypotheſis; the Origine of Good and Evil not to be known by natural Religion. If Mr. *Blount*'s Supposition be granted, concerning the *Perſians*, the *Deiſt* muſt be an Idolater: his reaſon for plurality of worlds refuted: the principal Arguments of *Ocellus Lucanus* reſell'd, his Age examined; with ſome uncommon Obſervations relating to him; and our Author's great Vanity, in making him cotemporary with, or ancienter then *Moſes*, expoſed. *Mr. Blount*'s great Argument for a double Creation, out of the firſt and ſecond Chapters of *Geneſis* enquired into, and proved ineffectual. From hence we may ſee the reaſon, why in his 5th Page, he propounds it as a Difficulty, how diſtinct pieces of the World ſhould be Peopled, as *America*, and the like, without a miracle; and of *Mathuſalem*'s being the longeſt liv'd of all *Adam*'s Poſterity: becauſe in his Hypotheſis of two diſtinct O-

riginals of mankind, they have an eaſie Solution; although they have a truer, and a much eaſier one in ours. This method of his, is indeed allowable in Philoſophy, which varies according to every new *Phænomenon*, but hath no place in matters of Religion.

His Diſingenuity, in relation to *Cicero*, reproved; the Difference between *Ocellus* and the *Chaldæans*, is obſerved.

There are many other Matters contained in this Book, which for Brevities ſake I have omited, but are perſpicuouſly treated of, and I hope, to the Readers ſatisfaction.

Two things remain, which I think fit to acquaint my Reader with: one is, that theſe Oracles are many of them tranſcribed out of modern Authors, of whom I have taken no Notice, but require all at Mr. *Blount*'s Hands, he being the Perſon that gave them the Title of Oracles: neither take I any Notice of others concerned, he being the chief Architect.

The other is, that theſe Controverſies depending much on Authority, I am neceſſitated to make frequent appeals to

Greek

Greek and *Latin* Authors; whom, for the Benefit of ſome Readers, I have tranſlated into *Engliſh*; where, if I have not kept my ſelf ſtrictly to the Words, yet I have taken all care not to deviate from the true ſenſe.

Laſtly, As in all Duty bound, I humbly ſubmit the cenſure of what I have written, to my Superiors in the Church of *England*.

Farewel.

Mr. *BLOUNT's*

By reaſon of the Author's being abſent from the Preſs, theſe Errata's have been committed, which the Reader is deſired to obſerve. The Latin and Greek Errata's are omitted, becauſe the Greek and Latin being Tranſlated into Engliſh, the Reader will ſoon perceive the Errata's in thoſe Learned Tongues.

ERRATA.

EPiſt. Dedicat. pag. 1. line 11. read principal. Pref. Sect. 4. r. ſowed with Chriſtianity, not ſorted, Sect. 6. l. 8. r. falſly, not fully, Sect. 8. r. of ſomething, not on, p. 2. l. 12. r. third, not three, p. 11. l. 12. r. quantus, not quontus, p. 27. l. 1. r. colligere, not colegere, & p. 27. l. 3. r. caſtigaſſe, not caſſigaſſe, p. 28. l. 29. r. politicians, p. 29. l. 5. r. ſed, not ſen, and l. 7. r. ipſe, not ipſi, l. 18. r. doctiſſimos, not Doctiſſimas, and Theologos, not Theologes, and l. 21. r, alii, not alis, p. 38. l. 13. r. who abuſe, not abſue, p. 54. l. 5. r. of the Grace of Immortality, not and Immortality, p. 59. l. 14. r. ſcriptores, not Scriptures, p. 74. l. 30. r. includes, not include, p. 86. l. 11. and 12. r. patricides, not petricides, and Elmacinus, not Elma cinus, p. 96. l. 20. r. Viſion, not Verſion, p. 103. l. 20. & 21. r. with reſpect to the preſent Clergy of *England* is ſo manifeſt, that it would be a madneſs to refute him, p. 105. l. 12. r. pertimeſcimus, not parti meſcimus, p. 109. l. 20. r. might add, not muſt add, p. 125. l. 27. r. lib. 1. c. 12. not 22. p. 129. l. 30. r. be true, not well, p. 139. l. 10. r. deduction, not reduction, p. 163. l. 21. r. and affirmed that, p. 167. l. 24. r. unſeaſonable, uot unreaſonable, p. 181. l. 1. r. as we, p. 194. l. 23. r. according to the uſual, not of the uſual, page 232. l. 23. read, for my.

Mr. *BLOUNT's* Oracles of Reaſon,

Examined and Anſwered,

In Nine SECTIONS, *&c.*

SECT. I.

Of the Moſaic *Creation, and the Divine Miracles.*

MR. *Blount*, Page the Second, ſays, *That many Fathers of the Church have concluded, that the whole* Moſaic *Creation ſeems to have been but a pious Allegory.*

ANSWER.

ANSWER.

It is worth obſerving, that although the Author of theſe pretended Oracles of Reaſon hath little regard for the Holy Scriptures; and without all peradventure, leſs for the Fathers of the Church: yet upon all Occaſions he makes uſe of their Authorities, and frequently quotes them.

Upon reading this Imputation, and his faſtning ſuch a Charge upon many Fathers of the Church, I forthwith conſulted Mr. *Dally* of the Uſe of the Fathers, Book the ſecond, Chapter three and fourth; where he treats profeſſedly of the Fathers Errors; and I find nothing there that favours this bold Aſſertion. On the contrary, I find an Expreſſion of *Dally*'s from the unanimous Conſent of the Fathers; which if it be true, this of the Oracle muſt neceſſarily be falſe.

None of the ancient Fathers can be charged with this Miſtake; if *Origen* (his Interpreters I take not into the Number) and perhaps St. *Ambroſe*, be excepted.

St. *Ambroſe*, Chap 2. of *Paradiſe*, ſpeaks not of above One that was of this Opinion; and the Margent refers us to *Origen*. Whereas had it been true what theſe Oracles ſuggeſts *p.* 49. That in the firſt Ages of the Chriſtian Church, the more candid Interpreters deviated from the literal reading of *Moſes*'s Hiſtory;

St. *Ambroſe*

St. *Ambroſe* could not have been ſuppoſed to have paſſed it over in ſilence.

But whatever the Sentiments of theſe two Fathers were; this is certain, that the allegorizing Method, and the cabbaliſtick Strain, ſo much uſed by *Origen*, was condemned in the fifth General Council; as *Photius* informs us in his Epiſtle to *Michael* Prince of *Bulgaria*. The fifth General Council. κατεδίκασε καὶ ἀνεθεμάτισεν ὠριγένην, condemned and anathematiſed *Origen*; and that for this reaſon, becauſe this his allegorizing Method would introduce into the Church Pagan Fables and Greek Mythology. And thus we ſee how Mr. *Blount*'s many Fathers are dwindled into Two. The Principle cenſured by the Univerſal Church; and St. *Ambroſe* hath ſo compiled his Hexameron, that he ſeems rather to have followed the Opinion of *Hippolytus* and *Baſil*, then that of *Origen*.

Pag. 3. *There are in Scripture, Stories that do exceed the Fables of the Poets; and to a captious Reader, ſound like* Garagantua *or* Bevis.

ANSWER.

Who can with Patience hear God's Word to be ſo vilified? a *Lucian*, a *Celſus*, or a *Julian*, could not have more depreciated the Scriptures by any prophane Compariſon. *Lipſius* in his *Political Monitions* and *Examples* tells us, that there was one *Ochinus* who was wont to ſay, That *Moſes & Chriſtus fuerunt inſignes*

Impostores qui genus humanum seduxerant: That *Moses* and Christ were famous Impostors, and deceivers of Mankind. These few Lines of our Author seem not to be much inferior in Blasphemy. He tells us *p. 6. That the Devil disswaded his belief from the Miracle of the brazen Serpent.* And *p. 7. That the Devil made him query where the Miracle of the* Manna *was in the Days of* Moses. I think without breach of Charity it may be presumed, that the Divel perswaded him thus reproachfully to derogate from holy Writ. Neither will his *salvo* subjoyned from the Influence of the little Finger of the Almighty, make a sufficient Compensation for so great a Crime.

Pag. 4. *I could shew a Catalogue of Doubts never yet imagined nor questioned as I know of; I can read the History of the Pigeon that was sent out of the Ark, and not question how she found out her Mate, where* Lazarus's *Soul was, before he was raised from the Dead, nor raise a Law Case, whether his Heir might lawfully detain his Inheritance bequeathed to him by his Death: and he, though restored to Life, have no Plea nor Title to his former Possessions.*

ANSWER.

I profess I am asham'd to trouble my Reader with such Impertinence; yet I hope I may be excused, because the Repetition of these Whimseys serve to declare what a Trifler our *Deist* is; and

and that he wants ſolid Reaſons to impugn the holy Scriptures. *Suetonius* in the Life of *Tiberius Cæſar*, Chap. 70. ſays, That *Tiberius* was want to exerciſe Grammarians with theſe Queſtions: *Quæ mater Hecubæ? quod Achillis nomen inter virgines fuiſſet? Quid ſirenes cantare ſuut ſolite?* Who was the Mother of *Hecuba*? What was *Achilles*'s Name when under diſguiſe he was converſant with the Virgins? What Songs were the *Sirens* wont to ſing? Which Doubts *Suetonius* there calls, and deſervedly too, *Hiſtoria fabularis uſque ad inepti as atque deriſum*. Fabulous Hiſtory, and ſuch as ought to be deſpiſed and laughed at. This Cenſure is applicable to theſe Doubts; and to uſe his own Words, *p.* 4. are fantaſtick Queries and Atomes in Divinity.

Pag. 5. *How all Kinds of Creatures, not only in their own Bulks, but with a competency of Food and Suſtenance might be preſerved in one Ark, and within the extent of Three hundred Cubits, will not appear very feaſible.*

ANSWER.

This Difficulty puzled *Celſus* too; who as *Origen* ſays *p* 191. called the Ark by way of contempt, παιδίοις μυθολογία; a Bauble and Scarecrow for Children. 'Tis not ſtrange, that *Celſus* ſhould thus calumniate, who being an Epicurean Philoſopher, and a great Friend of *Lucian*'s, had without Controverſie with the

reſt of that Heard, a great Averſion to the clear and perſpicuous Mathematicks.

Plutarch tells us in his Book againſt the *Epicureans*, That they accounted thoſe Sciences amongſt the Number of them, which contaminated a Man's Mind: and that they wonderfully magnified *Apelles*, for that he had kept his Mind pure from theſe Pollutions. Some Knowledge of which is yet requiſite for the underſtanding the Dimenſions of the Ark; as *Gerhard Voſſius* ſhews in his ſeventh Chapter of the *Mathematical Sciences*, *p.* 30. and to that purpoſe cites St. *Auſtin*. And *Gaſſendus* in his *Inaugural Orations*, hath this Expreſſion, *Et cum patres cæteros, tum ſpeciatim beatas Hieronimum & Auguſtinum paſſim declarare, quam hæ diſciplinæ neceſſariæ ſunt ad Scripturæ ſacræ interpretationem.*

And as the other Fathers in general, ſo in particular, St. *Jerome* and St. *Auſtin* often declare how neceſſary theſe Sciences are for underſtanding the Holy Scriptures. But that Mr. *Blount* (who, as I am told, had ſome Knowledge this way) ſhould ſtumble here, is to me ſtrange.

He that will take the Pains to read the two little Treatiſes of *Butio de Arca*, and *Matthæus Hoſtius de Fabrica Arcæ*, in the Criticks at large, will find the Capacity of the Ark for the above mentioned Purpoſes ſo fully demonſtrated, as will make the Matter feaſible. Wherefore with the moſt learned Dr. *Stillingfleet* (now

(now Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*) in his *Origines Sacræ*, *p.* 552. I think it better to refer to the Authors themſelves then here to Tranſcribe them.

Pag. 5. *There is alſo another ſecret not contained in Scripture which is more hard to comprehend, and put the honeſt Father (St.* Auſtin*) to the Refuge of a Miracle: and that is, not only how the diſtinct Pieces of the World, and divided Iſland, ſhould be firſt planted by Men, but Inhabited by Tigers, Panthers, and Bears; how* America *abounded with Beaſts of Prey, and Noxious Animals.*

ANSWER.

St. *Auſtin* was never famed for his Skill in *Coſmography*; *lib.* 16. *de Civit. Dei. c.* 7, he makes his Appeal to the Miniſtery of Angels, by the Command or Permiſſion of God. Had St. *Auſtin* lived in our Days, he would not have betaken himſelf to ſo remote a Solution. I ſhall therefore to this purpoſe cite ſome of our greateſt *Geographers*, by which it will appear, that this thing is not ſo hard to be comprehended as our Author beats us in Hand that it is. *Keckermant* in the ſecond Book of his *Geography c.* 4. lays down this Poſition —*Incertum eſt an novus orbis cohæreat Europæ & Aſiæ.* And he ſtrengthens the ſame by the Teſtimony of *Jacob*; *Chinæus lib. Paſter. Geogr.* and by *Gemma Friſius*, *c.* 30. *Brerewood* in his *Enquiries*, *c.* 13. ſome Parts

of *Asia* and *America* are continent one with the other; or at most, disjoyned by some narrow Channel of the Ocean. Dr. *Heylin* in his *Cosmography*, *p.* 1017. the West-side of *America*, if it be not continent with *Tartary*, is yet disjoyned by a very small Streight, as may be perceived in all our Maps and Cards; so that there is into these Countries, a very quick and easie Passage. *Gerard Vossius*, *de Scientiis Mathematicis*, *p.* 242. says, *Ex Asia per fretum Anianum, non difficilem fuisse Navigationem in Mexicanam, atque inde facillimum transitum in peruanam.* I must confess nothing pleases me more then the common Saying, *Omnia modice & intra modum.* Yet I must subjoyn what *Josephus a Costa* says relating hereunto, both upon the account of Mr. *Boyle*, who in his History of Cold, commends the said *a Costa*, as a very inquisitive and philosophical Person: as also, upon the said *Acosta*'s own account, who was for a long time a Traveller in *America*. In his Natural and Moral History of the *West-Indies*, *p.* 393. he says, *The Old World joyns with the New in some Part, by which Men and Beasts may pass.* And *p.* 503. *If there be any Sea betwixt the Old World and* America, *it is so narrow, that wild Beasts may easily swim over, and Men may go over in small Boats.* So that without a Miracle, here is a plain Solution of this Difficulty, how the remote Parts of the Earth might be Planted with Men, Tygers, Panthers, Bears, &c.

Pag.

Pag. 5. *'Tis a Paradox to me, that* Methusalem *was the longest liv'd of all the Children of* Adam; *and no Man will be able to prove it, while from the Process of the Text I can manifest it may be otherwise.*

ANSWER.

'Tis no Paradox to believe that which hath been opinioned by most Men, and in most Ages, and is Established on good Grounds; although it may not unexceptionally be Established by the Process of a Text; and such is the Case of *Methusalem*'s long Life. The Instances in *Lucian de Longævis*, and in *Phlegon Trallian*, of the same Subject, come very short of the Age of *Methusalem*. *Josephus* indeed, in the first Book of his Antiquities, *c.* 4. cites *Hesiod*, *Hecatæus*, *Hellanicus*, *Acusilaus*, *Ephorus*, and *Nicolaus*; who affirm, that some lived to a Thousand Years. And *Pliny* in the seventh Book of his Natural Histry, *c.* 48. confirms the same. But each of those Authors leave us uncertain as to the Point in Hand. *Josephus* lessens the Authority he produceth, by insinuating the little Credit to be had to his Authorities; περιμὲν τούτων, ὡς ἂν ἑκάστοις ἦν φίλον οὕτως σκοπεῖτοσαν neither doth he express how they made their Computation.

Pliny destroys the Authority he brings, by telling us, that some account six Months to a Year; some three Months, some a Lunar Month;

Month ♃ as namely, the *Ægyptians*: and that this is the reaſon why ſome were ſaid to live a Thouſand Years. Which Latitude ſhould we aſſume, *Methuſalem* may be ſaid to have lived ſome Thouſands of Years. But the Computation of Time in the *Moſaical* Writings is moſt certain: the Years are there according to the Courſe of the Sun, the Months according to the Courſe of the Moon; as will plainly appear.

The time of the Children of *Iſrael*'s eating *Manna* is accounted fourty Years, in the end of the ſixteenth Chapter of *Exodus*, and reckoned from their departure out of *Ægypt*, *Numbers* the 33d. Chapter, Verſe 38. Which Number from the ſame Seaſon of the Year, to the ſame by the Years of the Sun, is moſt exact; for they came forth of *Ægypt* the fifteenth Day of the firſt Month, in the beginning of Barley Harveſt; and the very ſame Day of the ſame Month in Barley Harveſt their *Manna* ceaſed, *Joſh.* 4. ver. 12. In the 25th Chapter of *Leviticus*, the *Iſraelites* are commanded to ſow their Fields, and cut their Vineyard, and gather the Fruits thereof ſix Years; and to let the ſeventh reſt as a Sabbath Year to the Lord. And ſeven of thoſe Sabbaths are accounted Fourty nine Years; at the end whereof, in the tenth Day of the ſeventh Month began the Jubilee. Theſe Years were manifeſtly Years of the Sun; otherwiſe all the Fruits of thoſe Years could not have been gathered in Harveſt

veſt and Vintage, as God appointed: for Fourty nine Years of the Moon would very near have cut off One and a Half, the laſt expiring in Winter, before any Corn or other Fruit were ready to be gathered therein.

St. *Auſtin* in his fifteenth Book, *de Civitate Dei, cap.* 14. writing againſt the Opinion of ſome, who were perſwaded, that the Years of the Ancient Fathers, which lived in the firſt Age, were not of the Sun; uſeth theſe Words, *Tantus tunc dies fuit quantus & nunc eſt. Tantus tunc menſis, quantus & nunc eſt quem Luna cœpta & finita concluſit. Tantus annus, quantus & nunc eſt, quem duodecim menſes Lunares, additis propter curſum ſolis quinque diebus & quadrante, conſummant.*

The Day was as long then (ſaith he) as it is now, the Month as long then as now, contained within the compaſs of the Moon's Courſe from the beginning to the end. The Year was then as long as now, perfected by twelve Months of the Moon, with five Days and a Quarter added. So that the Year in the Writings of *Moſes* was a ſolar Year; the ſame we uſe at this Day. The Months mentioned by *Moſes*, were lunar Months compleat. This is manifeſt by the Hiſtory of *Noah*'s Flood, in the ſeventh and eighth Chapters of *Geneſis*; where we are taught, that the Flood begun the ſeventeenth Day of the ſecond Month; and the Ark reſted on a Mountain of *Ararat*, in the ſeventeenth Day of the ſeventh Month: which

which Space, by God's holy Spirit, is there counted a hundred and fifty Days; which reckoning giveth to every Month thirty Days apiece, neither more nor less.

Of this Opinion was St. *Austin* in his fourth Book, *de Trinitate*, *chap.* 4. *Si duodecim menses integri considerentur quos triceni dies complent, talem quippe mensem veteres observaverunt, quem circuitus lunaris ostendit.* That is, If the whole twelve Months be considered, which contain thirty Days apiece, such was the Month observed by Men of Old Time, even that which the Course of the Moon sheweth.

According to this Measure of Time, the Days of *Methusalem* were Nine hundred sixty and nine Years; and it doth not appear that any other of *Adam*'s Posterity lived so long. I have been the longer on this pretended Paradox, because this Instance is commonly made use of to invalidate the holy Scriptures; and because the right stating of the scriptural Years and Months is of good Use in these Controversies.

Pag. 7. *I know that* Manna *is now plentifully gathered in* Calabria; *and* Josephus *tells me, in his Days it was as plentiful in* Arabia; *the Devil therefore made me quere, where was then the Miracle in the Days of* Moses, *since the* Israelites *saw but that in his time, which the Natives of those Countries behold in ours?*

AN-

ANSWER.

The Authority of *Joſephus* is of little Moment in this caſe. Mr. *Gregory* of *Chriſt Church* in his Diſcourſe of the ſeventy Interpreters, *p.* 33. hath theſe Words, *When* Joſephus *cometh to the Miraculous Paſſages of holy Writ, he uſeth a fair way of Diſſimulation, ſtill moderating the wonder of a Work, that he bring it down to the Heathens Faith, and make it for ordinary Belief.* And of this the ſaid *Gregory* giveth ſome Inſtances; as in the *Iſraelites* paſſing through the Red Sea, of the Sun's ſtanding ſtill in *Gibeon*, of *Nebuchadnezzar*'s change into a Beaſt, &c. So that the Devil and our Author have appealed to an incompetent Judge: Yet it muſt be confeſt, that there ſeems ſome Foundation for this Doubt; for very great Naturaliſts have given ſome Countenance to this Objection. As *Valeſius* in his *Sacra Philoſophia*, *c.* 57. and *Picus Mirandula*, and *Salmuſh* in his Commentaries on *Pancirallus's Res Memorabiles*, *lib.* 2. *tit.* 6. But he that conſiders what the Author of *Pſeudodoxia Epidemica*, *lib.* 7. *c.* 7. truly ſays, will be ſatisfied of the Invalidity of this Quere.

No one part thereof, ſaith he, will anſwer the Qualities of the *Iſraelites Manna*, as to fall upon the Ground to breed Worms to melt with the Sun to taſt like freſh Oil to be ground in Mills, to be like Coriander-ſeed,

and

and of the Colour of Bdellium. And to this purpose in the Margin he cites the learned *Chrysost. Magnenus de Manna.* Nor will all kinds of *Manna* have the Properties of the *Israelites Manna*, mentioned in the sixteenth Chapter of *Exodus*; he that gathered much had nothing over, nor he that gathered little had any lack; that which was gathered on the sixth Day did not stink as at other times; on the Sabbath Day it was not to be found on the Fields: nor could any other *Manna* be kept as this was for all Generations. Now if any Person can prove these Properties in the present *Manna* of *Calabria* or *Arabia*, the Quere cannot be Answered.

Pag. 8. *There are great Errors in reading the Scriptures, in relation to Divine Miracles; as the Darkness at the death of our* Saviour; *which some say, was spread over the Face of the whole Earth: Others, and some able Interpreters, have only Translated it, upon all the Land of the* Jews, *viz.* Palestine, *which the* Hebrews *always meant, when they said the Earth.*

A N-

ANSWER.

That Errors may be committed in reading the Scriptures, is a thing too notorious. But ſeeing onr Author's Deſign is to diſparage Holy Writ, (*Quid verba quæro cum facta video*, I may ſay with the Comedian); and by telling the World there are Stories in it, which exceed the Fables of the Poets, and ſound like *Garagantua* and *Bevis*.

He plainly inſinuates, that little Regard is to be had to Scripture-Miracles. I ſhall lay down what is ſufficient for aſſerting the moſt remarkable Inſtances that he mentions; that the Darkneſs at the Death of our Saviour was over the Face of the whole Earth, (with relation to the Univerſality of the Globe) cannot be proved from the Original, nor from our laſt Tranſlators of the Bible; who render it, Darkneſs was over all the Land; that is, *Judea*. So Dr. *Hakewill* in his Apology, *Lib.* 5. *p.* 218.

The Words in the Original are, σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. That the Univerſality of this Darkneſs, as to the Globe of the Earth, cannot be from hence concluded, we have the Authority of the moſt learned Criticks in the *Greek* Tongue. *Caſaubon* in his Annotations on the *Greek Teſtament*, hath on theſe Words, this Remark; *Annotant Homeri Interpretes, vox* πᾶς *interdum apud, bonas auctores* παρέλκειν, διὰ τὸ

καὶ

καὶ απίθανον νὶ ἀδύνατον *quod huic loco convenit.* And then he adds, *Assentior enim iis, qui sic hunc locum, & marci similem, c. 15. ver. 33. interpretantur.* And to the same purpose *Erasmus, Nam quod ait Evangelista, tenebras factas super Universam terram; ejus regionis terram intellexit assentiente Divo Hieronymo, & asseverante Origene in Homiliis, quas scripsit in Matthæum.* The Sum of which is, that the Word πασα infers not this Conclusion. And as to the Word γη, or Earth, our most learned Arch-bishop *Tennison* in *Hobb*'s Creed observes, *p.* 65. doth often signifie not the whole Word, but the Land of *Palestine.*

Selden in his *De jure Naturæ & gentium juxta Hebræos, lib.* 6. *c.* 18. affirms, That the Word *Earth*, is six hundred times used by the *Talmudists*, for the Land of *Israel.* 'Tis used, says he, in this Manner, by the Evangelists; *Palam hæc terræ notio*, c. 15. Marci, ver. 33. *tenebræ factæ sunt per totam terram usque in horam nonam.* As also by St. *Luke*, Chap. 4. Ver. 25. *Fames facta est magna in omni terra.* Which things considered, it will appear, that the Darkness was only over the whole Land of *Judea*: or to use Mr. *Gregory*'s Words in the Preface to his Reader, *The Face of the whole Earth (at our Saviour's Crucifixion) is to be meant, of the Land of* Judea; as it is elsewhere. So that Mr. *Blount*, by Printing those Words in a distinct Character; and intending to perswade his Reader, that this is an Error committed in rea-

reading the Scripture, Artificially endeavours the ſubverting the Veracity of the Miracle.

There is one Difficulty yet behind, and that is, Whether this Darkneſs was occaſioned by an Eclipſe of the Sun, or by the Interpoſition of Clouds, or by the ſhrinking in of the Sun Beams, like the Darkneſs of *Egypt*? Of this Opinion, were *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Hierom*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Theophylact*, *Euthymius*, and *Julius Africanus*, who reproves *Thallus* for calling it an Eclipſe, as being an unadviſed Speech, and indeed it was ſo; for one Miracle would ſuffice for the Darkneſs; but a total Eclipſe, and that for the ſpace of Three Hours, at the full Moon (for it was at the *Jewiſh* Paſſover) would include many great Miracles.

Wherefore for the better underſtanding of this Miracle, we will briefly mention what we have met with in good Hiſtory, concerning the Suns Darkneſs, and obſerve what was peculiar in that, at our Lords Death.

Trebellius Pollio tells us, That in the days of *Gallienus*, that there were Earthquakes and a Darkneſs for many days. St. *Jerom ad Pamachiam*, that about the days of *Pentecoſt*, the Sun was ſo darkned, that Men thought that the day of Judgment was at hand; which could not be an Eclipſe, as *Scaliger* rightly obſerves; whether you take it for the *Jewiſh* or *Chriſtian Pentecoſt*.

Cedrenus ſays, That in the days of *Juſtinian*, the Sun for a whole Year together was of a

Duskish Colour, as if it had been in a perpetual Eclipse. The like strange Accidents are reported by *Pliny*, and *Theophanes*; but our late Naturalists have made it appear that there is nothing Miraculous in these Effects; but none can presume to say so by this Darkness; That observes, *First*, that it was only in the Land of *Judæa* where our Saviour Suffered. *Secondly*, That it was only between the *Sixth* and *Ninth* Hour, nor more, nor less; the precise time of the Crucifixion. *Thirdly*, That it was accompanied with an Earthquake. *Phlegon* (in his *Cronican* cited by *Origen* Cant. Celium *lib.* 2.) says, there were then many Earthquakes, it was accompanied with renting the Vail of the Temple, renting Rocks, opening Graves, *&c.* enough to extort a Confession from the *Centurion* that Christ was the Son of God.

Page 9. *That God brought back the Shadow of those Lines, that it had gone down in the Dial of* Achaz, *back Ten Degrees. Here some affirm, that the Sun went not back in the Heaven (as 'tis generally believed) but only in the Dial of* Achaz; *For, say they, if the Sun went back in the* Zodiac, *or that Degree of the Ecliptick stand still, which He was a running that day, the* Primum-Mobile *came also backward, and with it all the rest of the* Spheats: *if we say He went back only in the* Zodiack, *and a Tenth part of the* Zodiack; *then say they, the Sun must needs return through a great many Signs of the* Zodiack, *and bring back with him past Months, yea, and Seasons of the Year. Besides, that*

that this Sign was seen only in the Land of Judah, *and not in* Babylon.

ANSWER.

What kind of Dial King *Ahaz* His Dial was is not yet agreed on by the Learned in that Science. *Gafferell* in his unheard of Curiosities *P.* 280. hath these words, *As for the Figure of it, there is no Man hitherto, that hath Published what it was.*

Mr. *Gregory* in his Preface, is of opinion, that King *Ahaz* His Dial is like none of ours now in use.

Godwin in His *Jewish* Antiqities, gives this account, *The Dials in use among the Ancient* Jews *differ from those in use among us; the time of the day was not distinguished by Lines, but by Degrees. In the Dial of* Achaz, *the Sun went back Degrees, not Lines; the Prophet* Isaiah *makes no mention of Lines.*

When our Author therefore speaks of the Shadow of Lines, 'tis no wonder that He misapprehends this Miracle: 'tis not to be doubted, but that the Miracle was in the going back of the Sun, and not in the going back of the Shadow; the latter being the effect of the former.

All Mathematicians agree in this, that a Dial may be made between the Tropicks, on which the Shadow may naturally go back. And *Clavius* hath demonstrated that the same

may be done on a Dial made without the Tropicks. In our Elevation here in *Exeter*, a Plane may be fitted for such a Poler Altitude, as will make a Retrocession of the Shadow Natural. I Remember a good Mathematician told me, that he made a *South* Vertical Dial, for the Right Honourable the late Lord *Clifford*, of *Chudleigh* in *Devon*; on which this *Phænomenon* of the Shadows going back might be seen: the Degrees mentioned in this Miracle, are primarily to be understood of those in Heaven, for they are the Degrees most properly so called; therefore the Sun with the *Primum-Mobile*, and the *Celestial Sphears*, went so far backward in their Diurnal Motion, as made up the space of Ten Degrees in the Equinoctial Line, which answered to Two Third parts of an Hour on the Dial of *Ahaz*.

The Difficulties which are suggested, are grounded on great Mistakes; as if Equinoctial Degrees and Signs of the *Zodiack* were the same thing; and that the Retrocession of the Sun, Ten Degrees in the Polar Altitude of *Jerusalem*, should bring back with Him Ten Months, or Ten Signs of the *Zodiack*; an Error inexcusable in the meanest Astronomer.

Of the like nature is that other, From the Miracles being visible only in the Land of *Judah*, and not at *Babilon*. For the Acuteness of this Arch of Ten Degrees was such, with relation even to those in *Judæa*; that it could not be perceived

perceived there, unleſs *Geometrically* obſerved by a Quadrant or Aſtrolabe. And I am certain that there is no Aſtronomer but muſt confeſs, that altho the Miracle conſiſted in the going back of the Sun; yet it was more apparent, by the going back of the Shadow on the Dial. So that, had there not been a going back of the Shadow, the Miracle might have been loſt, and no Man might have obſerved it. The Arch of the Ten Degrees in the Suns going back, being (as I have ſaid) ſo Acute, as that it was not to be perceived, but by the help of ſuch Inſtruments, which the *Jews* (as far as I have Read) never had.

Pag. 10. *Others will not allow that the Flood of* Noah *was upon the whole Earth, but only upon the Land of the* Jews; *not to deſtroy all Men, but only the* Jews.

A N S W E R.

If there has been any Authors ſo abſurd, as to limit the Flood to the Land of the *Jews* (as Mr. *Blount* ſays there have been) they are not to be Defended.

The only Modern Author of any repute, (that I have met with) who bounds it within narrow limits, is *Iſaac Voſſius* in His *Diſſertation de ætate Mundi*; where he hath theſe Words, *Longe abſunt a veritate, qui exiſtimant* Noachi *ætate per Univerſum orbem propagatas fuiſſe homines, qui ne* Syriæ *quidem &* Meſopotamiæ *fines*

forſan exceſſerant ut vero Diluvii Inundationem ultra Orbis habitati Terminos producamus, nulla jubet ratio: Imo prorſus abſurdum ubi nulla hominum ſedes, illic etiam viguiſſe affectus pœne ſolis hominibus inflictæ. That is,

They are far from truth, who think that in the days of *Noah*, Mankind was propagated through the whole Earth. Whereas perhaps, there were then no Men, but thoſe, who lived in *Syria* and *Meſopotamia* Now that the Deluge ſhould exceed the Bounds of that part of the Earth, where Men were Seated, ſeems not Rational to believe: Nay, 'tis abſurd to conceive, that there ſhould be any effects of Puniſhment where there were no Offenders.

And the ſame *Voſſius*, in His *Caſſigationes ad Scriptum* Georgii Hornii, *in Defence of His Opinion*, ſays, *Non defuiſſe omnibus ſeculis, qui Moſem ſic interpretati ſunt; olim ſic ſenſit* Theodorus, *cumque ſecutus eſt* Theodoretus; *& ex Orthodoxis quæſtionibus quæ inter opera* Juſtini *Martyris exſtant, clare colligi poteſt multas Chriſtianas ſic ſenſiſſe.*

Clare quoque Joſephus *oſtendit, non Univerſam Terram fuiſſe Inundatam, cum dicit* εις θαλασσαν την ἠπειρον μετέλαβε *Continentem in mare mutavit* ἠπειρος *minus eſt quam* οἰκουμένη *ſive Terra habitata: illam enim in ires* ἠπειρους *ſive Continentes partiuntur veteres, quod notiſſimum. Pro toto vero Terrarum Orbe, nuſquam ea vox accipitur.* That is, There have been ſome in all Ages, that have Interpreted *Moſes* as I have done: Anciently

ently of this Oppinion were *Theodore*, *Mopsueſten*, *Theodoret*; and it appears out of the Orthodox Queſtions, among the Works of *Juſtin Martyr*, that many Chriſtians were of that opinion.

Joſephus clearly ſhews the Deluge was not over the whole Earth in its utmoſt Latitude; when he ſays, *The Continent was changed into Sea.* A Continent is leſs than the Habitable World; which the Antients divide into Three Continents.

And whereas *Andrew Colvius* objects to *Voſſius*, *The Univerſality of the Expreſſions in Scripture, relating to the Flood.*

Voſſius makes this Reply: *Quis neſcit Vocabulum omnis paſſim in Sacris Literis ambiguæ eſſe ſignificationis, & rariſſime, abſolute accipi, plurimis vero locis reſtringi ad ſubjectum de quo agitur. Ut apud* Moſem, Gen. 41. *Cum famem ſuper Univerſam Orbem invaluiſſe ſcribit, non niſi de aliqua orbis portione intelligendum eſſe fatentur Theologi, quid abſtat igitur quo minus cum Deus dicitur Inundaſſe Univerſam Terram; totam Terram habitatam, & Omnia habitatæ telluris animalia intelligamus?*

Who is ſo ignorant as not to know, that the Word (*all*) is every where in the Holy Scriptures of an ambiguous ſignification, and very ſeldom put abſolutely; in moſt places 'tis reſtained to the Subject Matter: As in *Gen.* 41. When the Famine is ſaid to prevail over the whole Earth, Divines underſtand it of ſome part of the Earth; What ſhould hinder, but

that the ſame may be underſtood in this caſe of the Flood, and the deſtruction of all Creatures?

This is moſt certain from the Holy Scriptures. That all Mankind (*thoſe in the Ark excepted*) were deſtroyed by the Flood. For the occaſion thereof is thus expreſſed in *Geneſis*. *And God ſaw the wickedneſs of Man was great upon the Earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually: and the Lord ſaid I will deſtroy Man whom I have created from the face of the Earth.*

And (again) *all Fleſh died that moved upon the Face of the Earth; and every Man, and every living Subſtance was deſtroyed that was upon the Face of the Ground, both Man and Cattle; and the Creeping things, and the Fowl of Heaven, and they were deſtroyed from the Earth, and* Noah *only remained alive, and they that were with Him in the Ark.*

So that Mr. *Blount* is very vain, in Muſtering up the Arguments he pretends to be brought to prove, that the Flood was only in the Land of the *Jews*. And *Voſſius* ſeems to be in a great Error, in limiting the ſame to *Syria* and *Meſopotamia*. For as it ſeems ſtrange, that in ſo ſhort an Interval as that was from *Adam* to the Flood; according to the ordinary Computation 1656 Years, and not much above Two thouſand according to the largeſt, the World ſhould then be fully Peopled: So it alſo ſeems no leſs ſtrange, that in ſuch a ſpace of time

Syria

Syria and *Meſopotamia* ſhould only be Peopled. Beſides, it cannot be well imagined, that ſo many Nations ſhould have knowledg thereof, if it were not of a much greater extent; For *Voſſius* confeſſeth that almoſt all Nations had knowledg thereof, the *Egyptians* only excepted. *Joſephus a Coſta* Witneſſeth for the *Americans*, and ſo doth *Laet. Martinus* for the *Chineſes*; for the knowledge of others, *Bochart* in his *Geogr. Sacra*, and *Grotius* in his *Annotata* on the Firſt Book of the Truth of the Chriſtan Religion.

And now we draw towards a Concluſion, I ſhall not uſe any other Words, then thoſe which are uſed by the moſt Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet* (now Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*) in his *Origines Sacræ*, *p.* 539 and 540.

I cannot ſee any urgent neceſſity from the Scripture to aſſert, that the Flood did ſpread it ſelf over all the ſurface of the Earth.

It is evident that the Flood was Univerſal as to Mankind, but from thence follows no neceſſity at all, of aſſerting the Univerſality of it, as to the Globe of the Earth, unleſs it be ſufficiently proved; that the whole Earth was Peopled before the Flood: which I diſpair of ever ſeeing proved.

I grant as far as the Flood extended, all Creatures were deſtroyed; but I ſee no reaſon to extend the deſtruction of theſe, beyond that compaſs and ſpace of Earth where Men Inhabited.— All theſe are the Aſſertions of that great Man.

So

So that I ſuppoſe the vanity of Mr. *Blount's* Suggeſtion is apparant, by *this right the Notion of the Flood.*

Pag. 12. *I muſt ingeniouſly confeſs, Original Sin, was ever a difficult Pill with me to ſwallow; my Reaſon ſtopping it in my throat, and not having Faith enough to waſh it down.*——And p. 15. *never did any Church enjoyn Penance, or Repentance for Original Sin: wherefore it ſeems preſterous and unreaſonable, that any Man ſhould be Damned for that, which no Man is bound to Repent.*

ANSWER.

That Mr. *Blount* hath not Faith to waſh down Original Sin, which ſticks in his Throat, is a thing to be lamented; this truth being ſo plainly laid down in Holy Writ, that no Man (who hath any regard for the Scriptures) but will be offended with him, for Writing ſo contemptably of this Doctrine.

The chief Argument which he brings for his opinion, taken from Penance and Repentance is of no force: But becauſe I think 'tis new, I will conſider it.

In the Primitive Church Penance was only impoſed for Three Crimes, *viz.* Idolatry, Homicide, and Adultery; which is proved at large by *Morinus* in his fifth Book *de Penitentia, cap.* 3. out of *Fathers and Councils*; and he concludes the Chapter thus —— *Tot igitur & tantis Teſtimonis*

Teſtimonis freti, recte nobis videmur Colegere, quadringentis prope annis a Chriſto nato, Patres hæc ſola tria crimina Penitenta Caſſigaſſe.

Truſting to ſo many Teſtimonies, we think we may truly conclude, that for almoſt Four Hundred Years after our Saviour, no Penance was Impoſed, but only for theſe Three Crimes.

Now if Mr. *Blount*'s Negative Argument, with relation to the Practice of the Church be valid; how many Men have lived in the World without Actual Sin? So that his Argument proves too much, a moſt certain ſign of its Weakneſs.

As for the Second part of his Argument; *That no Church ever required Repentance for Original Sin*, is a miſtake, and proceeds from not knowing the Churches Practice.

In the Primitive Church, Repentance was required of all adult Perſons, who deſired Baptiſm; which muſt relate to Original as well as Actual Sin.

Tertullian in his Book *de Baptiſmo*, ſays, *Ingreſſuras Baptiſmum, orationibus crebris, jejuniis, & geniculationibus crebris & pervigiliis orare aportet, & confeſſione omnium retro delectorum.* Such as intend to be Baptized, muſt prepare themſelves by frequent Prayers, Faſtings, frequent Humiliations, Watchings, with Confeſſion of all their Sins.

Agreeable to this ancient Practice; our Church begins its Office of Baptiſm with the Confeſſion of Original Sin; in theſe Words, *Dearly beloved, for as much as all Men are conceived*

ved and born in Sin—— and our Church prays for the Pardon of the same in these Words, *We call upon thee for these Infants, that they coming to this Holy Baptism, may receive Remission of their Sins by Spiritual Regeneration:* And to the same purpose, before *Tertullian*, we have *Justin Martyr*, in his second Apology, where he says, *That those who were to be Baptised*; jejunare docentur, nobis una, cum illis, & orantibus, & jejunantibus, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. They are required to Fast, the Congregation also praying and fasting together with them.

Now the Church requiring all Catechumens to renounce all Sin, the Devil, and all his Works, to confess all their Sins, to fast and pray for God's Pardon, in order thereunto; What is this but Repentance, as well with relation to Original, as Actual, Sins? Besides, he promises amendment in this particular, Never to be lead by his corrupt Affections.

Agreeable hereunto, is that in the Larger Creed in *Epiphanius*'s *Ancorate*, where Baptism is call'd, Baptism of Repentance, and in the Creed of the Church of *Jerusalem*, *I believe one Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins.*

Pag. 16. *It hath been a Point very much disputed among several Politicians in the Commonwealth of Learning, Who was the real and true Author of the* Pentateuch. P. 17. *It is evident, that*

that the five Books of Moſes *were written by another Hand after his Deceaſe.*

ANSWER.

Gregory the Great, in his Preface on *Job*, diſcourſing about the Author of that Book, hath theſe Words, *Sed quis hæc ſcripſerit, valde ſupervacue quæritur; cùm tamen auctor libri, ſpiritus ſanctus fideliter credatur. Ipſi igitur hæc ſcripſit, qui hæc ſcribendo dictavit; ipſe ſcripſit, qui & illis operis inſpirator extitit.* It is to no purpoſe to enquire after the Author of this Book; it is ſufficient to believe, that the Holy Ghoſt is the Author. He therefore writ the Book, who dictated the things that are written in it; he writ it, by whoſe Inſpiration it was written.

Hieronymus a ſancta fide, p. 54. truly ſays, *Conſtat Theodoretum & complures alios patres, doctiſſimaſque ætatis noſtræ Theologes in ea eſſe ſententia, ut de autoribus multorum veteris inſtrumenti librorum nihil certi affirmari poteſt, ut pluribus verbis oſtendit ſixtus ſenenſis, & alis qui hoc argumentum tractarunt.* It is manifeſt, that *Theodoret* and many other Fathers, and the moſt learned Divines of our Times are of Opinion, that nothing can certainly be determined, who were the Writers of many of the Books of the Old Teſtament; and this is proved at large by *Sixtus Senenſis*, and others who have examined and treated of this Argument.

Dr. *Ham-*

Dr. *Hammond*, diſcourſing concerning the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, whether it be St. *Paul* or St. *Luke*, makes this Concluſion, 'All which can be ſaid in this Matter can 'amount no higher than too probable or con-'jectural; it is no Matter of any Weight or 'Neceſſity, that it be defined, who the Author 'was, whether St. *Paul* or St. *Luke*, a conſtant 'Companion of St. *Paul*'s for many Years, and 'the Author of two other Books of the Sacred 'Cannon.

I know not any thing juſtly to be cenſured in the Opinions of thoſe Divines; thoſe are to be blamed that miſunderſtand and miſapply what they have truly written. This I am ſure of, that nothing can be drawn from them, which may be any way ſerviceable for Mr. *Blount*'s deſign; who with a ſtrange Boldneſs dares to affirm, that *Moſes* was not the Author of the *Pentateuch*.

There is no Book in the World, whoſe Author can be more plainly demonſtrated, than that of the *Pentateuch*; it can be made appear out of the Holy Scriptures; for which, if Mr. *Blount* had any Reverence, he could never have fallen into ſo great an Error. It can be made appear from the Conſent of all Nations, and all Authors (except ſome Modern ones) who make any mention of the *Pentateuch*; whether Jews, or Chriſtians, or Gentiles, they all admit it as a certain Truth, that *Moſes* was the Author thereof.

Our

Our Saviour, in the fifth Chapter of St. *John*, Ver. 46, and 47, ſays, 'Had ye believed *Moſes*, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me —— But if ye believe not his Writings how ſhall ye believe my Words.

Therefore *Moſes* writ, and he writ thoſe Books, which the Jews read as writ by him; and no Man can deny, but thoſe Books are the *Pentateuch*. 'Tis certain that Chriſt always diſtinguiſhed the Prophets from the Law of *Moſes*, and by the Law underſtood the *Pentateuch*. *Philip* ſaid to *Nathaniel*, John 1. *We have found him, of whom* Moſes *writ in the Law, of whom the Prophets have ſpoken*, Luke 24. Ver. 27. *And beginning at* Moſes *and all the Prophets, he expounded to them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himſelf.* And in the 15th of the *Acts*, Ver. 21. *For* Moſes *of old time hath in every City them that preach him, being read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day.*

Out of which it appears without all peradventure, that *Moſes* writ the Law, by which Word, *Philo Judæus* and *Joſephus* ſay, the whole *Pentateuch* is meant. And that the Modern Jews underſtand the Word *Law*, in the ſame manner, we have the Authority of *Leo Modena*, a Rabbi of *Venice*, in his Hiſtory of the preſent Jews throughout the World, in which Book, *p.* 247. he hath theſe Words:

'We

'We ſhall here in the laſt place, give the 'Reader a View of the Thirteen Articles of 'their Belief, as it is delivered by *Rabbi, Moſes 'Egyptus*, in his Expoſition upon the *Miſcna* in '*Sanedim*, *cap. Helech*; which Articles are 'generally believed by all Jews without contra: 'diction.

The Seventh Article of their Faith is, That *Moſes* was the greateſt Prophet that ever hath been; and that he was endued with a different and higher Degree of Prophecy, than any other.

The Eighth is, That the Law which was given by *Moſes* was wholly dictated by God; and that *Moſes* put not one Syllable in of himſelf.

What this Law is, appears out of the firſt Page of that Hiſtory, among the Rites which are obſerved by all the Jews, and he ſays, are the Precepts of the *Written Law:* Namely, ſuch as are contained in the *Pentateuch*, or five Books of *Moſes*, which are in all, Six hundred and thirteen in Number; that is to ſay, Two hundred forty eight affirmative, and Three hundred ſixty five negative. And theſe they call *Mizuoth de Oraita*; that is to ſay, *Precepts of the Law.*

From hence we may conclude without all manner of doubt, that by the Word *Law*, (in our Saviour's Speech, and in thoſe other places of Scripture which I have cited) the whole *Pentateuch* is underſtood.

The

The Teſtimony which is brought from the Conſent of all Nations, is ſo fully explicated and declared by *Huetius*, that none can doubt of the Truth thereof; and to whom I had rather refer my Reader, then here to tranſcribe him. Eſpecially, conſidering I have ſo fully proved the ſame from the Holy Scriptures, and Indiſpntable Authority.

I ſhall only add two or three Obſervations hereunto belonging, and conclude this Point.

The Firſt Obſervation is, that neither *Julian* nor *Porphiry*, nor any of the moſt inveterate Enemies of the Chriſtian or Jewiſh Faith, did ever make it a Queſtion, whether *Moſes* was the Author of the *Pentateuch*. The firſt that ever ſtarted thoſe Objections againſt it, and are now ſo much valued, was one *Abenezra* a Jew; who, although he did not dare to be ſo bold fac'd, as to deny openly ſo important a Truth: yet, by the Difficulties he propoſed, and by the manner of his propoſing them, (as Mr. *Blount* doth his Oracles) he plainly enough inſinuates to an intelligent Reader, that his deſign was no other, than to overthrow the Authority of the *Pentateuch*; out of his Storehouſe it is, that *Hobbs*, *Spinoſa*, and other ſuch Politicians in Mr. *Blount*'s Commonwealth of Learning, have furniſhed themſelves with Objections, ſuch as they are, and which have been often anſwered.

My Second Obſervation is, That not only *Philo Judæus*, *Joſephus*, and all others, as well Ancient and Modern Jews, did underſtand by the Law, the whole *Pentateuch*; but alſo the Gentiles did underſtand it in the ſame manner: and conſequently it cannot be imagined, that the Law mentioned by our Lord ſhould be taken in a different Senſe.

The Author I ſhall cite for Proof hereof, is *Dionyſius Longinus*, in his Book, περὶ ὕψους Sect. 7. ταύτῃ καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, ἀνὴρ οὐ τυχὼν οὐδενός, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐγνώρισε, εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ γράψας τῶν νόμων, εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς, γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο.

So the Legiſlator of the Jews, no common Perſon, when he declares and makes known the Power of his God, according to his Majeſty, preſently in the beginning of his Laws, he tells us, that God ſaid, *Let there be Light, and it was ſo.*

Longinus in this place, calls the beginning of *Geneſis*, the beginning of *Moſes*'s Laws. And if *Geneſis* comes under that Denomination, I think no queſtion can be made of the other Books, nor of the true Senſe of thoſe places by me brought out of the New Teſtament.

My Laſt Obſervation is, That one of the great Proofs of revealed Religion depends on the Antiquity and Verity of the *Moſaic* Writings, if theſe Books were not written by *Moſes*, a wide Gate would be opened for Libertines

tines and Deiſts to redicule them, and to expoſe them for Fables. Preadamitiſm and the Eternity of the World, might be received as uncontronlable Doctrines; and Chriſtian Religion deprived of the Support of thoſe Writings, to which our Lord was pleaſed to make an Appeal.

So that is is no wonder that Mr. *Blount* ſhould be ſo poſitive, and endeavour with ſuch Confidence to ſubvert theſe Writings, by affirming, That it is evident that *Moſes* was not the Anthor of them. He well knowing, that his pretended Oracles of Reaſon will be accounted Scandalous and Falſe, as long as this part of Holy Scriptures, the *Moſaic* Writings, can be defended.

SECT. II.

Of PARADISE.

IN this Section, the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation is wickedly ridiculed. What *Ireneus* ſays of ſome of the Ancient Hereſies, *viz.* That the very naming of them is a ſufficient Refutation; the ſame may be ſaid of ſome Paſſages I ſhall here *Tranſcribe.*

Pag. 25. *There is a Dialogue between the Serpent and* Eve: *It hapned upon a time, that* Eve *ſitting ſolitary under a Tree, without her Husband, there came to her a Serpent or Adder, which, I know not by what Means or Power, civilly accoſted the Woman, in theſe Words, or to this Purpoſe.*

All hail moſt fair One, What are you doing ſo ſolitary and ſerious under this Shade?

Pag. 26. Eve *ſays*, Let me ſee, had I beſt uſe it, or no? What can be more beautiful than this Apple? How ſweetly it ſmells? but it may be, it taſts ill.

Serpent. *If it taſts ill, throw it away, and ſay I am a great Lyar.*

Eve. Well, I'll try; thou haſt not deceived me. Give me one that I may carry it to my Husband.

Serpent.

Serpent. *Well thought on, here's another for you; go to your Husband with it. Farewel young Woman.*

Pag. 27. *God ſays to the Serpent*; Hereafter vile Beaſt, inſtead of eating Apples, thou ſhalt lick the Duſt of the Earth; and as for you, Miſtreſs Curious, in ſorrow ſhall you bring forth Children.

Pag. 33. *It perplexes me, how out of one Rib, the whole Maſs of a Womans Body could be built, for a Rib doth not equal the hundredth, perhaps not the thouſandth Part of an entire Body.*

Pag. 44. *The Text ſays*, They ſewed Fig-Leaves together, and therewith made themſelves Aprons. *From whence you may deduce the Original of the Taylors Trade; But where had they Needles, and where their Thread, the very firſt Day of their Creation, ſince the Thread-makers Art was not yet found out, nor yet the Art of Working in* Iron.

ANSWER.

In this Section are many ſuch Queries; but theſe are more then ſufficient to make any Man *Nauſeate*. For what Man that hath but a Mite of Piety, will not be concerned to read ſuch Expreſſions? to read the Holy Oracles of God to be thus droll'd on, by theſe pretended ones? and this ſacred Book of God to be thus expoſed by a ſcurrilous *Libel*.

Our Author often cites the Canons of the Church when they ſerve his Turn. Here he mentions none; and I am certain there is good Reaſon for it: for not to mention ancient Canons, which he muſt neceſſarily know, condemns this Practice. The Council of *Trent* condemns it, and in Seſſion 4th. condemns them who ſhall convert and wreſt the Words of Holy Scripture, to Prophaneneſs, Scurrilouſneſs, Fabulouſneſs, Flatteries, Diſtractions, Superſtitions, or too ſcurrilous Libels.

The firſt Council of *Millain* declares, That their Raſhneſs is very wicked, who abſue the Words or Sentences of Holy Scripture, to Flattery, Contumely, Superſtition, Impiety, or to any prophane Purpoſes; and that the Biſhops are to puniſh ſuch Offenders according to the holy Canons.

So that as far as I know, this folly of our Author in ſporting thus with Holy Scripture, is condemned by all Chriſtians, of any particular Denomination in the whole World.

What is material, and worthy of Conſideration in this Section, we will now examine.

Pag. 36. *Theſe are the Words of* Moſes; There comes a River out of *Eden* to water the Garden, and from thence it divides it ſelf into four Branches; the Name of the firſt is *Piſhon*, &c. *Gen.* 2. *Ver.* 10. *Whereby it is apparent, that either in the Entrance or Exit of the Garden, there were four Rivers, and that thoſe four Rivers did proceed from one and the ſame Fountain-*

head

head in *Eden*; Now pray tell me in what part of the Earth, is this Country of *Eden*, where Four Rivers ariſe from one aud the ſame Spring?

ANSWER.

That there may be a plain and a full Solution of the difficulties, the Oracle propoſes both in this Paragaph, and in the other, which ſhall be examined in this Section.

I ſhall premiſe a Conſideration or Two, of good uſe in the Matters under Debate.

The *Firſt Conſideration* ſhall be of the Opinions of the Ancient *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, as to this Book of *Geneſis*.

The *Second* ſhall be of the great alterations that have happened to many places of the Earth ſince the Creation: Out of which it will appear, that many places then well known, may now be wholy unkuown to us.

Laſtly, I ſhall make a brief Reply to what the Oracle hath here declared.

The *Firſt Conſideration* relating to the Ancient *Jews*, is that they always looked on the Book *Geneſis*, as a Book hard to be underſtood; yet to contain a literal Senſe.

St. *Jerom* in his Preface to his *Commentaries on Ezechiel*, says, *Nisi quis apud eos ætatem Sacerdotalis Ministerii; id est, tricesimum annum impleverit, principium Geneseos legere non permittitur.* Unless a Man had attained to the Year of the Sacerdotal Ministry, which is the Thirtieth Year compleat, they were not permitted to Read the beginning of *Genesis*; Which Practice appears also out of the *Prologue Galeat*, and from *Origen* on the *Canticles*: we are told by both, that the *Jewish* Doctors forbid these Four things (because of their Difficulty and Profoundness) to be read by any, but such as attained to Thirty Years of Age; and those were, the Three First Chapters of *Genesis*, the beginning and end of the Prophet *Ezechiel*, and the Book of *Canticles*: This Decree of the *Jewish* Doctors is also mentioned by *Prosper Aquitanicus*, *lib.* 3. *de Vita Contemplativa*, *c.* 6. Where he gives us a good Account thereof; and contends for the literal Sense.

Now altho they accouut this Book obscure; yet I do not find, that any of the Ancient *Jews* excluded a literal Sense, *Philo Judæus* excepted, whose Arguments are very weak, and unbecoming so great an Author.

It was a known rule among the *Rabbies*, that Scripture falls not in with the Midrash, *i. e.* The Scriptures are to be Interpreted in a literal Sense. And *Buxtorf de punct. Antique.* tells us, That when the Allegorical or Cabalistick Sense is contrary to the Literal, the Cabalistick is to

be

be rejected; neither muſt we think otherwiſe of the Modern *Jews*, if they will be conſentaneous to themſelves, and the Eighth Article of their Creed.

Out of which it neceſſarily follows, that altho the *Jews* allowed an Allegorical Senſe, yet they never allowed any which interfered with the Literal.

If we conſult the Ancient *Chriſtians*, we ſhall find; that they were careful to preſerve the Literal Senſe of *Geneſis*. *Epiphanius in Ancorato*, *c.* 57. Εἰ τοίνυν οὐκ ἔνι παράδειστος ἀισθητὸς οὐκ ἔνι πηγὴ, οὐκ ἔνι ποταμὸς, *&c.* If there be no Literal and Senſible Paradiſe, then there is no Fountain, no River, no *Piſon*, no *Gihon*, no *Tigris*, no *Euphrates*, no Fruit, no Leaves, no *Adam*, no eating the Forbiden Fruit; but the whole truth is a Fable, and nothing but Allegory: And *c.* 54. of the ſame *Ancorate*, he calls *Origen* (θελατος ὠριγένης) *a furious Mad Man*, for his obtruding on the World Allegory inſtead of a Literal Truth.

St. *Jerom* in his Comentaries on *Daniel*, *c.* 10. Writing ſomething with relation to the *Moſaical Creation*, ſeems to be much concerned, in theſe Words, *Eorum deliramenta conticeſcant, qui umbras & imagines in veritate quærentes, ipſam conantur ſubvertere veritatem; ut flumina & Arbores & Paradiſum putent allegoriæ legibus ſe debere ſubruere.* Let their follies be gone, who ſearching after ſhadows and Images in the Truth, endeavour the ſubverſion of the Truth it ſelf; and think

to

to bring Trees, Rivers, and Paradiſe it ſelf, under their Rules of Allegory.

St. *Auſtin lib.* 8. *de Geneſi ad literam, cap.* 1. Having delivered His opinion, that ſome things in *Geneſis* may admit (as he calls it) *a Spiritual Senſe*,— doth then in general declare,— *Narratio in his Libris, non genus locutionis figuratarum rerum eſt, ſicut in cantico canticorum; ſed omnino geſtarum eſt ſicut in Regnorum libris & hujuſcemodi Ceteris.* The account which we have in the Book of *Geneſis* is not Allegorical or Figurative, as in the Book of *Canticles*, but it is Hiſtorical and Literal, as in the Books of the Kings, and ſuch like Hiſtorical Books.

As to the *Secoud Conſideration*, which relates to the great Changes which have happened to the Surface of the Earth; I need not ſay much, ſince I think it is taken for granted by all, that have any acquaintance with Hiſtory, or Geography. We Read in *Plato*'s *Timæus*, of a Diſcourſe between the *Egyptian* Prieſts and *Solon*, about Six Hundred Years before our Saviour: *Solon* is told there, that of old Time without the Streights of *Gibraltar*, there was a very great Iſland called *Atlantis*, bigger then *Aſia* and *Africa* put together, and the ſaid Iſland was afterward by a great Inundation and Earthquake, in one Day and Night wholly overwhelmed and drowned in the Sea.

Some

Some of the Ancients, as *Strato*, quoted by *Strabo* in the first Book of his *Geography*, say, that the *fretum gaditanum* or Streight of *Gibraltar* was forcibly broken open by the Sea: The same they affirm of the *Thracian Bosphorus* and *Hellespont*, that the Rivers filling up the *Euxine Sea*, forced a Passage that way, where there was none before; of the like nature is that account of the *Samothracians* mentioned by *Diadorus Siculus*.

The River *Arnus* in *Tuscany*, now falleth into the Sea, Six Miles below *Piza*: Whereby it it appeareth (saith Dr. *Hakewel*) that the Land hath gain'd much upon the Sea in that Coast, for that *Strabo* in his time reporteth, it was but Twenty Furlongs (that is but Two Miles and a half) distant from the Sea.

Varenius Conjectures, That all *China* (which is as bigg as all *Europe*) or a great part of it, was raised Originally from the Sea; for that great and impetuous River called the *Yellow* or *Saffron* River, coming out of *Tartary*, and very often overflowing the Country of *China*, is said to contain in it so much Earth and Sand, as make up a Third part of its Waters; the evenness and level Superficies of the whole Country of *China* renders this conjecture the more probable, as that great Phylosopher Mr. *Ray*, is of opinion in the 5*th*. Chapter of the Consequences of the Deluge.

I ſhall here add, what we find to this purpoſe, in that excellent Geographer *Maginus*, in his Preface; and in *Ocellus Lucanus*. *Certum eſt*, (ſays *Maginus*) *Inſignes variationes in terræ partibus continuo evenire propter aquarum Inundationes; marium præruptiones ac receſſus etenim non ſolum Regiones, urbis, oppida, flumina, & alia hujuſmodi ſua nomina pro tempore mutant, amiſſis prorſus prioribus; Verum etiam & fines ipſarum Regionum variantur, & urbes oppidaque ſenectute delentur. Mare in uno loco Continentem Terræ dilatat, in alio coarctat; & flumina quandoque augeſcunt, quandoque minuuntur quandoque curſus variant, quandoque etiam prorſus deficiunt ſic quoque fontes, ſtagna, paludes alibi exiccantur, alibi vero procreantur.*

'Tis certain there are great variations on the Surface of the Earth, which continually happen by Inundations, the breaking in and receſs of the Sea. Nay, not only Countrys, Citys, Towns, Rivers, and the like, change their Names, but alſo Limits and Bounds; the Sea in one place gains on the Land, in another place it loſeth. Rivers ſometimes grow, ſometimes leſſen; ſometimes change their Channel, ſometimes wholy fail: Fountains, great ſtanding Waters and Marſhes in ſome places are dried up, and appear in other places, where they never were before.

Ocellus Lucanus, (who is an Author much valued by Mr. *Blount*) p. 217. *of the Oracles*, hath theſe Words, *Now corruptions and violent alterations are made according to the parts of the Earth;*

ſometimes

ſometimes by the overflowing of the Sea: Sometimes with the dilating and parting of the Earth by Winds and Waters impriſoned in the Bowels thereof; but an Univerſal corruption of the Earth never hath been, nor ever ſhall be. Now altho *Ocellus Lucanus* be falſe in his Concluſion, yet he is right in his Premiſes.

Of the truth of this Coſideration, Mr. *Blount* himſelf ſeems to be convinced, in *pag.* 36. where he hath theſe Words,— *But to end all theſe difficulties or Controverſies concerning the Originals and Channels of the Rivers that watered* Paradiſe, *you will perhaps at laſt ſay, that the Springs as well as the courſes of Rivers have been changed by the Univerſal Deluge, and that we cannot therefore be now certain where it was that they formerly broke out of the Earth, and what Countries they paſt through. For my part, I am much of your Opinion, provided you confeſs there happened in the Deluge ſuch a Fraction and diſruption of the Earth, as we ſuppoſe there did.* ——

This Suppoſition is that of the late Theory of the Earth, which we can by no means grant, and which the Authors before Cited never Dreamed of.

And now I return a brief ſolution to the difficulties propoſed *pag.* 36. He would be told in what part of the Earth this Country of *Eden* is, where Four Rivers ariſe from one and the ſame Spring?

This

This is indeed a difficult Queſtion, and not to be Solved: But then I muſt ask him another Queſtion, of no leſs difficulty; and that is, in what place of *Geneſis Moſes* ſaid this? In the whole Hiſtory of the Creation, no ſuch thing is affirmed by *Moſes*.

Huet Biſhop of *Soiſſons*, in his Learned Treatiſe of the *Situation of Paradiſe*, *p.* 44. returns this Anſwer, if by theſe Words, *and a River went out of* Eden *to water the Garden*; Moſes *had meant, that this River ſprung out of the Earth in* Eden, 'tis evident his Narative had been defective, and to make this compleat, it ſhould have been in theſe Words, *and a River had its ſpring in the Land of* Eden, *from whence it run along to water the Garden.*

And *p.* 48. the ſame Learned Biſhop ſays, Moſes *hath marked it plainly enough, that a River went out of* Eden *to water the Garden*; for theſe words gives us to underſtand that there was but one River in the Garden, and in *Eden*, and Conſequently that the diviſion did not happen there.

So that the Idea Mr. *Blount* hath conceived of Paradiſe, ſeems to be as Groſs as that of *Mahomet*'s; who when he entred into theſe Particulars, affirmed, that the firſt River with which Paradiſe was watered, was of pure Water, the ſecond of Milk, the third of Wine, and the fourth of Honey.

The

The ſame great Prelate, *Pag.* 53. ſays, Moſes *did not ſay, whether the Diviſion of the River happened above or below Paradiſe, or whether it happen far or near.* He denoted it plainly enough, when he named the four Channels or Rivers which grew from that Diviſion. Thoſe four Rivers were ſo well known in the Places where *Moſes* then was, and to thoſe to whom he wrote, that it was enough to name them, that they might be known. Yet he was not contented with it; and as if he had foreſeen that future Ages and far Nations, who were alſo concerned in the Deſign of this Work, might want ſome clearing of this Matter, He gave ſo evident Tokens to make thoſe Rivers known, that no Man can miſtake them but for want of Heed. And for the further ſatisfaction of the Reader, I had rather refer him to the Author before cited, than here to tranſcribe him.

Out of all which 'tis evident, what great Injury he hath done to the Truth, by affirming, that it is apparent in the Book of *Geneſis*, that the four Rivers proceeded from one and the ſame Fountain-head in *Eden*: Whereas there is not the leaſt Footſtep of any ſuch thing in the Divine Hiſtory. 'Tis evident what Wrong he hath done to ſome unwary Readers, by deceiving of them, and miſleading them, in a thing of ſo great Moment. Laſtly, 'Tis evident of what Frame and Make of Mind Mr. *Blount* was, who would not ſtick at any Methods,

right

right or wrong, to obtain his Point againſt *Moſes*. Whoſe Hiſtory of the Creation, although *Origen* (in his Commentaries, generally corrupted and depraved) ſays, 'tis allegorically to be underſtood; yet in his Third excellent Book againſt *Celſus*, which all the World acknowledges to be Genuine, he hath this Paſſage worthy of Remark.

Μωϋσης ἰυσεβης ἀνὴρ, καὶ μετέχων θειοτέρου πνεύματος τὰ συμβεβηκότα ὡς ἀληθείας εἶχον ἀνέγραψεν.

Moſes was a very pious Man, one endued with the Divine Spirit, and wrote his Hiſtory with Truth and Fidelity.

Pag. 49. *I am angry with* Celſus, *who calls this Account an old Wifes Fable; upon which* Origen *replies very well by way of Anſwer*, ὅτι μετὰ τροπολογίας ταῦτα εἴρεται. That theſe things were ſpoken in a figurative Senſe. However, *Celſus* himſelf does in what follows, acknowledge, that the faireſt Interpreters, both among the Jews and Chriſtians, were aſhamed of the literal Senſe, and therefore accommodated them to Allegories.

ANSWER.

No Man who hath read Mr. *Blount*'s Oracles can believe him, when he ſays, he is angry with *Celſus*, for expoſing and ridiculing *Moſes*'s Narration.

Origen

Origen in his Anſwer obſerves, that *Celſus* ſpeaks in this place, neither of *Paradiſe* nor of *Eden*, nor of the Tree of Life, nor of that of Good and Evil; but that he calls *Moſes*'s Account of the Serpent, an Old Wifes Fable.

To which *Origen* anſwers, οὐκ ἀσέμνως, (a word omitted by Mr. *Blount*) τροπολογεῖσθαι; a Man may not be thought immodeſt, that conjectures there may be ſomething of Figure: Something that may move the Reader to ſeek for ſome conſiderable Matter under a figurative Expreſſion.

It is evident that *Celſus* was wont often to ſay, that the more modeſt Jews and Chriſtians in theſe Difficulties, had Recourſe to Allegory; and to avoid Shame renounced the Letter.

But *Origen* ſays, this was a Calumny, and made uſe of on purpoſe by *Celſus*, εἰς τὸ μισεῖν μόνον καὶ ἀπεχθάνεσθαι Ἰουδαίους καὶ χριστιανούς, to bring forth Jews and Chriſtians into Hatred and Contempt.

SECT. III.

Concerning the Original of Things.

MR. *Blount* in this Section, diſcourſeth of the Centre of the World, of the Phænomena's of the Heavens, of the Company of the erring and fixed Stars, the Original of the Ocean; and many ſuch like Subjects of Philoſophical Conſideration; which, becauſe they are things purely ſpeculative, and may be diſputed *pro* and *con in infinitum*, I ſhall paſs them over, and leave them to be conſidered on by the Reader at his leiſure.

Pag. 56. *Many Fathers of the Chriſtian Church were of Opinion, that before the Earth or Moſes's World, there had been Angels for many Ages unknown to us.*

ANSWER.

Mr. *Blount* hath enumerated many Fathers who were of Opinion, that before the Earth was made, Angels had a Being: And yet every one knows, that as many Fathers can be produced for the contrary Opinion. I know no general Council hath concerned it ſelf in this Controverſy; that of the *Lateran*, under *Innocent* the Third (which defines the Creation of the

the Angelical, as well as Mundane Subſtances in the beginnig of Time) is not accounted general by many learned Perſons, both of the Pontifician and Proteſtant Communion. From whence it follows, that this is a Matter of Opinion, and not an Article of Religion. 'Tis only required of us to believe that the Angels were created by God, and that they are not Coeternal with him; which is the true Reaſon of this Difference among the Fathers.

St. *Auſtin*, *lib.* 11. *De Civitate Dei*, *c.* 32. ſays, *proinde ut volet unuſquiſque accipiat---- dum a regula fidei non aberrat ut angelos ſanctos, in ſublimibus cœli ſedibus, non quidem Deo Coæternos nemo ambigat.* As to this Matter which relates to the Creation of Angels, whether before or after the Creation of the viſible World, let every Man enjoy his own Opinion, only take care you do not err from the Rule of Faith, and think that the holy Angels now in the heavenly Places, are Coeternal with God.

Sixtus Senenſis (to whom Mr. *Blount* ſeems to be beholding, although he names him not) *Lib.* 5. *Annot.* 5. tells us, that the learned Father *Theodoret* was of St. *Auſtin*'s Opinion, having diſputed this Point againſt St. *Bazil*; and that *Theodoret* concludes, that if you grant that the Angels were created, it matters not whether before or after the *Moſaic* Creation; *verbum pietatis non offendet*; he will violate no Rule of Faith.

St. *Jerome* in his *Epiſt. ad Cyp.* thinks that in the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the Creation, there is no expreſs Mention of the Creation of Angels, becauſe the common illiterate People, were not ſo capable as to apprehend their Natures.

Perenius on *Geneſis* propounds this Queſtion, Why *Moſes* did not mention the Creation of Mettals and Minerals, as well as that of Plants and Herbs?

To which he gives this Anſwer; *Becauſe Mettals and Minerals are hid in the* Bowels *of the Earth, and not ſo commonly known as Plants and Herbs*; *and that* Moſes *did not deſign to report all things in Particular, but firſt in General, to relate that all things in the Beginning were Created by God, whether in Heaven or Earth: and in Particular, ſuch things as were moſt common and evident to all Men.*

Thomas Aquinas hath alſo remarked, *That in* Moſes's *Writings we have no mention of the Creation of the* Air, *for that the ſame not being viſible, it was difficult to have a right Notion of that Body.*

Yet methinks if Men have no mind to be contentious, there is reaſon to believe, that the Angels were not created before the Heavens, the place of their Reſidence and Abode.

The *Jews* will tell us, that *Moſes* underſtood theſe Words of his; eſpecially of Angels, when he ſaid of God, *In the Beginning he created the Heavens.* And the Catechiſm of the Coun-

Council of *Trent*, in its Expoſition of the Articles of the Creed, lays down the ſame Opinion; where it ſays, *Cœli & terræ nomine, quicquid Cœlum & terra complectitur intelligendum eſt.* *Moſes* under the general Terms of Heaven and Earth, comprehended all things in both; Angels, as well as other Beings.

Pag. 54. *We can evince the ſame by the ſacred Oracles and Authorities of the Fathers, as well as by Reaſon and Arguments, the Fall of the Angels was before the Creation of the World.*

ANSWER.

Mr. *Blount* may evince from his own Oracles, that the Angels fell before the Creation of the World; but to prove it from the ſacred Oracles, he will find it difficult.

As to the Fathers, I have not obſerved above Two, who ſpeak clearly as to this Matter, and they are, St. *Cyprian* and *Arnoldus Bonæ Vallis.* St. *Cyprian* in his Book, *De Zelo & Livore*, hath theſe Expreſſions, *Diabolus inter initia ſtatim mundi, & perit primus, & perdidit. Ille Dei carus, & acceptus poſtquam hominem ad imaginem Dei factum conſpexit in Zelum malevolo livore prorupit. Et dum ſtimulante livore, homini gratiam datæ immortalitatis eripit, ipſe quoque id quod prius fuerat amiſit.* St. *Cyprian* is very plain, that the Devil did not fall before the Creation. He ſays, the Devil in the beginning of the World periſhed himſelf, and deſtroyed Man. He

who was dear to God, and accepted by him, after he ſaw Man was made in the Image of God, he was moved with great Envy and Malevolence, and being ſtirr'd up by theſe Affections, robs Man of the Grace and Immmortality, and himſelf loſt that which he enjoyed before.

Some think that St. *Cyprian* contradicts himſelf, for as much as he writes in the Book *De Cardinalibus Chriſti operibus* (which goes under his Name) *ante hoc temporale initium ipſe in principio, imo ipſe principium exiſtens apud Deum ante hominis conditionem ſuperbientis Diaboli ruinam videt & affectatæ dominationis ambitionem.* Where writing concerning our Lord, he ſays, *Before the Beginning of this World he was in the Beginning; nay, he was the Beginning himſelf, being with God before Man was created; he ſaw the ruine of the Devil, and of the Domination he affected.*

It muſt be confeſt that this place comes home, and is to the purpoſe. But then it muſt be confeſt, that not St. *Cyprian*, but *Arnaldus*, Abbot of *Bonæ Vallis*, was Author of thoſe Books.

Bellarmine de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis, proves St. *Cyprian* could not be the Author of that Book; becauſe he affirms, *Diabolum cecidiſſe de cœlo ante hominis creationem, cujus ſententiæ contrarium habet Cyprianus in Tractatu de Zelo & Livore.* That the Devil fell from Heaven before Man was created; whereas St. *Cyprian* teach-

et

eth the contrary in his Book, *De Zelo & Livore.*

Which Obſervation of *Bellarmine* is allowed of by *Dalle* in his Book, *De Libris ſuppoſitis Dionyſio & Ignatio, p.* 468.

Dr. *Thomas James*, in his Treatiſe of the Corruption of Fathers, informs us, That in an ancient Manuſcript in *All Souls* Library, the Author of this Book is of much later Date, written by one that lived in *St. Bernard*'s time, to whom he wrote one or two Epiſtles, and that he was called *Arnoldus Bonævillacenſis.*

We learn alſo from the foreſaid Manuſcript, that the Book was Dedicated not unto *Cornelius* the Pope, who lived Anno. 254. but unto *Adrian* the Pope, the Fourth of that Name, who was created Pope Anno 1154. and ſucceeded *Eugenius* the Third, to whom *Bernard* wrote his Books of Conſideration. And agreeable hereunto is Mr. *Dalle*, who in his Book before cited acquaints us, that the ſame is to be found in a Manuſcript in the French King's Library.

So that Mr. *Blount*'s Authority from the Fathers, is reduced only to One that delivers his Mind plainly, and he a very late one too, who lived ſome hundreds of Years after St. *Cyprian.*

And now we will ſee his Reaſon and Arguments.

He ſays, *p.* 58, and 59, 'Really 'tis not 'at all probable, that the moſt excellent Crea-'tures were made of ſo frail a Nature, as that 'the very day of their Birth they ſhould fall 'into Miſery and Evil.

Where we ſee, that after all thoſe Brags of Sacred Oracles, and Authority of Fathers, our Author with all his Reaſon and Arguments is forced to conclude with probability.

Pag. 59. *The Second* Nicene *Council, would have this Doctrine propoſed out of the Book of* John *Biſhop of* Theſſalonica *to be confirmed,* theſe are the Words, *concerning the Angels, Arch-Angels, and their Powers, to which I alſo joyn our own* Souls; *this is the Opinion of the* Catholick-Church; *that they are, 'tis true, intelligible, yet not wholly incorporeal and inviſible.*

ANSWER.

Suppoſing that it were true (*as it is not*) what Mr. *Blount* hath delivered concerning the Second *Nicene* Council's Confirming the Opinion of *John* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*; yet it cannot be concluded that this was the Opinion of the *Catholick-Church*, as to the Corporiety of Angels and Souls.

Who knows not that the Conditions commonly required to make a General Council which (only can Repreſent the *Catholick-Church*) were wanting to the Second *Nicene*?

Petrus

Petrus de Marca, lib. 2. *de Concordia c.* 17. gives us this Account,— *Secunda Synodus* Nicæna, *ab Eccleſia* Gallicana *in Concilio Francofordienſi repudiata eſt*; The *Gallicane* Church Aſſembled in the Council of *Francford* hath rejected the Second *Nicene* Council: And he ſubjoyns this excellent Reaſon, *Secundam* Synodum Nicenam *Oecumedicam dici poſſe negarunt, quod occidentis provinciæ per Epiſtolas more Eccleſiaſtico ſententiam rogatæ non fuiſſent.* The Second *Nicene* Synod was deny'd by them to be *Oecumenical* becauſe no regard was had to the Provinces of the Weſtern Churches in order to their conſent, according to the Cuſtom received in the Church.

And the ſame *De Marca, lib.* 6. *c.* 25. adds; *In Synodo* Francofordienſi,— *agitatum an Secunda Synodus* Nicene *recipienda foret tanquam ſeptima Synodus œcumenica— decretum autem in Canone Secundo, Synodum illam repudiandam eſſe & damnandam.* In the Synod held at *Fracford* it was Debated whether the Second *Nicene* Synod ſhould be received, as the Seventh General Council— but it was Decreed in the Second Canon, that it ſhould be rejected and Condemned.

Agreeable hereunto is that of *Launey*, ſome time a moſt Learned Doctor of the *Sorbon*, in his Epiſtles, *Par.* 8. *Epiſt.* 11. *Antiquiores & Gallia Scriptores* Nicænam *Secundam Univerſalibus non accenſent conciliis.* The more Ancient *French* Writers do not enumerate the Second *Nicene* Council, among thoſe which they account Univerſal: And *Launey* then deſcends to particulars

Particulars, proving the ſame by the Ancient *French* Annals and many Hiſtorians.

If we conſult the Church here in *Britain* in thoſe times, we ſhall find that they Rejected it alſo.

Simeon Dunelmenſis an Ancient and good *Engliſh* Hiſtorian, in his Book *de Geſtis regum Anglorum ad annum* 792. ſays, *That* Charles *King of* France *ſent a Synodal Book into* Britain *which he received from* Conſtantinople, *in which Book were contained the Decrees of the Second* Nicene *Council.* Now, how our Church in thoſe days was pleaſed, or rather diſpleaſed therewith, the ſame *Dunelmenſis* tells us,

In quo Libro, hu, proh Dolor! Multa inconvenientia, & verae fidei contraria reperiunt, maxime quod ibidem confirmatum imagines adorare debere, quod omnino Eccleſia Dei execratur. In which Book, alas! Many inconvenient things were found, and repugnant to the true Faith; eſpecially that which relates to the Worſhip of Images, which the Church of God doth utterly abominate. This Teſtimony is the more to be regarded, for that it appears from hence, that in thoſe days our Church abhorred Image Worſhip.

This Teſtimony is Recorded alſo by *Roger Hoveden*, *Matthew Weſtminſter*, and other our Ancient and beſt Hiſtorians: And ſo much confounded the *Romaniſts* in the begining of the Reformation, that their great Advocate *Harpſfield* could make no other Reply, but that it was *commentitia & inſulſa fabula*, a fooliſh, and an invented

invented Fable, and that it was not Written by *Simeon Dunelmenſis* or *Matthew Weſtminſter* (He makes no mention of *Roger Hoveden*, nor of the Manuſcript Hiſtory of *Rocheſter* in the *Cottonian* Bibliothec) whereas the ſame is now to be found in the Manuſcript of *Dunelmenſis* in *Bennet* Colledg Library in *Cambridge*: And thoſe who have been converſant in thoſe things, aſſure us that the ſame is to be ſeen in divers Manuſcripts of *Mathew Weſtminſter* and *Hoveden*, and that all old and uncorrupted Copies teſtifie the ſame thing. Of what Quallity *Dunelmenſis* was, I need not ſay much, ſince the Preface to the *Decem Scriptures*, is very full to this purpoſe; I ſhall only here ſay, that he is accounted one of our beſt Hiſtorians, by the Pontifician and Reformed Parties. He was Chantour of the Church of Saint *Cuthberts* in *Durham*, and continued his Hiſtory to the Days of King *Henry* the Firſt.

But, Suppoſing that this Synod was Univerſal, (or that which is all one) that the Opinion of the *Catholick-Church* might be gathered from it, as touching the Corporiety of Angels and Souls, Doth it appear that ſuch was the definition of that *Synod* in any of its Decrees? Or, doth it appear that they Confirmed the Opinion of *John* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* in this Point? No certainly, nothing leſs.

And for this we appeal to *Edmund Richer*, a Doctor of the *Sorbon*, in his Learned Hiſtory of General Councils, in his *Firſt* Book *p.* 655. where

where we Read,— *Angelos & animas esse Corporeas nequaquam approbavit* Synodus, *sed fuit peculiaris opinio Episcopi* Thessalonicensis; — The Second *Nicene* Synod did not approve of the Doctrine of the Corporiety of Angels or Souls, but it was the peculiar and private opinion of the Bishop of *Thessalonica*. And the same *Richer*, farther adds,— *Accedit in* Synodis, *non attendi oportere ad ea quæ privatus aliquis narrat, sed ad solam* Synodi *definitionem, ut alias observatum est.*

Besides, in Reading Councils, little regard is to be had to what a private Doctor or Bishop may declare or say, we ought only to look to the Decree or Definition of the Synod. And this (says *Richer*) I have Observed in another Place.

And now I may, without doing any wrong, Conclude; that Mr. *Blount* hath Read the Councils very negligently, and makes use of them at Second Hand. The same may be said of the Fathers he quotes. He hath injuriously imputed Heresy to the *Catholick Church*; and hath fastened an untruth on the Second Council of *Nice*.

Pag. 73. St. Austin *Would have all things that are said to be the Work of Six Days, to have been Created in one moment, altho* Moses *divided them into Classes and different times, that he might the better help the Imagination of the People, to Comprehend the First Originals of things. God Almighty did in my Opinion Create out of nothing in one Moment, and by one individual Act, all Substances, whether*

whether Intellectual or Corporeal; nor did St. Auſtin *in that come wide of the Work.*

ANSWER.

I Remember that *I* have Read ſomwhere in *Maldenate*, that *Gregory Nazianzen* Compares Hereticks in Reading the Fathers, to Flies; if they happen on any place that is ſound they paſs it over, if putrid or rotten, there they ſuck.

It muſt be Confeſt, that St. *Auſtin* was here, in a miſtake, and that in this Point he came wide of the mark, to uſe Mr. *Blount*'s expreſſion. St. *Auſtin* was indeed of this Opinion in *lib.* 5. *de* Geneſi *ad literam*, and *lib.* 6. *c.* 5. but the occaſion of his miſtake was Reading the Book of *Eccleſiaſticus* in *Latin.* And for the ſatisfaction of my Reader, I ſhall cite a place out of *Gerhard Voſſius* in his *Pars altera de Creatione theſis.* 16. Where he takes notice of this Miſtake of St. *Auſtins*, and the occaſion of it; and from whom we have a ſatisfactory Anſwer.

Hoc Siracidæ illo Eccleſiaſtici 18. *adſtrui poſſe cenſent. Qui vivit in æternum creavit omnia ſimul, ſed præterquam quod apocrypha canonicis opponi non debent, Græce eſt non ἅμα, ſed κοινῇ, hoc eſt pariter: ut ſententia ſit, omnia unum agnoſcere creatorem ſive communiter, ut in complutenſi, tranſfertur, hoc eſt, communi lege, ut Junius vertit, & accipi debere ſequentia inibi oſtenduni: quod ſi vidiſſet Auguſtinus*

guſtinus, non tantopere ſe in eo loco torſiſſet in Geneſi ad literam, lib. 5. c. 3. & lib. 6. c. 5.

By that place of *Siracides*, in the 18*th.* of *Eccleſiaſticus*, ſome think it may be proved, That God created all things not in any Intervals of time, but in one and the ſame Inſtant. The place of *Eccleſiaſticus* is commonly, but falſly tranſlated. —— *He that liveth for ever, created all things together, or at once,* —— but that beſides *Apocryphal* writings are not to be oppoſed to Canonical Scripture: The *Greek* hath another meaning; for in *Greek* the ſenſe is —— *He that liveth for ever, hath created all things in like manner.* So that the ſentence in *Eccleſiaſticus* is, *All things in like manner have one and the ſame Creatour.* Thus 'tis tranſlated in the *Complutenſian* Bible: or elſe, as *Junius* hath tranſlated it, *All things were created after the ſame method, as it were by a common Law.* And this is the genuine ſenſe of the place, as the following places in *Eccleſiaſticus* will convince us: Which if St. *Auſtin* had ſeen, he had not been miſled, nor had been put to ſo much trouble by this place.

No Man can have a greater deference for St. *Auſtin*, than my ſelf; yet I muſt confeſs, that both thoſe great Men, and the Governour of the *African* Churches, were but meanly skilled in the *Greek*. St. *Auſtin* confeſſes the ſame in his 8th. Epiſtle to St. *Jerom*: *Petimus ergo & nobiſcum petit omnis* Africanarum *Eccleſiarum ſtudioſa ſocietas, ut interpretandis eorum libris, qui* Græce *Scripturas noſtras quam optime tractaverunt, curam atque ope-*

ram

ram impendere non graveris: 'We desire, and together with us desires all the Studious Society 'of the *African* Churches, that he would not 'think it burthensom to bestow some pains in 'interpreting 'those Books which were written 'in *Greek* upon the holy Scriptures. And Father *Simon* in his Critical History on the Old Testament, Book 3. says, That *Austin* did not understand *Greek* well enough to read the *Greek* Fathers Commentaries upon the Bible; and therefore He desired St. *Jerom* to translate them into *Latin*, that he might read them.

Yet it must be granted, That although he was no Critick, He had yet some skill in that Language; for he makes sometimes mention of the *Greek* Codes, as Ep. 59. and in his Retractations: but his skill therein was so ordinary, as it often occasioned some mistakes. Upon the whole, 'tis very surprizing, that such a Critick in the *Greek*, as our *Deist* would be thought to be; when He saw St. *Austin's* slip (as He must unavoidably observe it, if he read Him of these matters) should yet make use of His Authority: it being certain, that the false *Latin* translation misguided that great Father. All the Question seems to be about the particular matter of the Creation, when God was pleased to make the World. And that this may be a thing of some difficulty, I think few men will deny that have well considered it. I am sure *Gassendus* in his *Physicks*, was of this opinion, when he says, *Majus est mundi opus, quam ut assequi mens humana illius molitionem possit.*

possit. 'The creation of the World is so great 'a work, that a Man can scarce comprehend it 'after a diligent intention. And I have often thought that this of *Gassendus* is not much abhorrent from that of *Solomon*, *Ecclesiastes* 8th. ver. 16. and 17. 'When I applied my heart to 'Wisdom, and to see the business that is done 'upon the earth (for also there is that neither 'day nor night seeth sleep with his eyes) ver. 17. 'Then I beheld all the work of God, that a Man 'cannot find out the work that is done under 'the Sun: because though a man labour to seek it 'out, yea further, tho' a wise man think to know 'it, yet shall he not be able to find it. *Maimonides* (who was in great Reputation among the Jews) determines the Question thus, *Omnia simul creata aberant, & postea successive invicem separata*; all things were created at once, and afterwards divided into separate Classes and Times.

However it be, 'tis certain St. *Austin* had a firm Veneration for the *Mosaic* History; he never ridiculed it, as our Author does; and if he mistook in the Interpretation of a place of *Genesis*, he may be excused, who submitted himself to the Rule of Faith, and constantly believed that the World had a Beginning.

And although our Author in this place thinks St. *Austin* came not wide of the Mark, yet I suppose he will not thank him for what he says in his 43d Chapter of Heresies, where he accounts the Origenists for Hereticks, for interpreting Paradise Allegorically, and not according to the Letter.

SECTION

SECT. IV.

Of the Modern Brachmans.

PAG. 77. *Having ſpoken already of the Modern* Brachmans *in the Indies, whom beſides the near Reſemblance of their Studies and Cuſtoms, we have ſeveral other Arguments to ſhow they are deſcended of the ancient Race.*

ANSWER.

There is a Treatiſe amongſt the Works of St. *Ambroſe*, whoſe Title is, *de Moribus Brachmanorum*; this Treatiſe is in three Libraries in *Italy*, *viz.* the Vatican, the Millain, and Medicean, under the Name of St. *Ambroſe*; but there are good Arguments to induce us to believe this Treatiſe to be Spurious. In this Treatiſe are ſeveral commendable Qualities of the *Brachmans* repreſented: and the Dialogue between *Dandamis* and *Alexander*, contains good Morality. But the Account we have here is ſo different from that in ancient Authors, as that it may eaſily induce us to conceive a vaſt difference between the Ancient and Modern *Brachmans*.

Pag. 78. *Now their Body of Learning doth not teach nor treat of each little Point or Nicity in Philoſophy, as our Modern Philoſophers uſe to do; but like the Natural Theology of the Ancients, it treats of God, of the World, of the Beginning and Ending of Things, of the Primitive State of Nature, of the Periods of Worlds, and their Renovations.*

ANSWER.

If our Modern *Brachmans* philoſophize in theſe things, as the Ancient *Brachmans* did; the Modern could not philoſophize out of Books given by God to the great Prophet *Brahma*, as formerly the Law of the Iſraelites was to *Moſes*; as Mr. *Blount* reports they were wont to pretend.

Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 451. ſays, *They worſhiped* Hercules *and* Pan. And a little after. σέβεσι τίνα πυραμίδα ὑφ' ἣν ὀσέα τινὸς θεὸν νομίζουσι ἀποκεῖσθαι. They Worſhipped a certain Pyramid, under which they thought a certain God to be buried. *Porphury* in his 4th Book, *De Abſtinentia*, accuſes them of Polutheiſm; and ſo doth *Quintus Curtius*, in his Eighth Book.

Maffeius, in his Book of the Indians; affirms that they worſhipped *God*, or a *Dæmon* in the Figure of an Ox, as the Egyptians did *Apys*; and that they alſo worſhipped an Elephant as God.

Pag.

Pag. 83. *They affirm there are ſeveral Worlds exiſting at one and the ſame time, in divers Regions of the Univerſe; and that there are ſeveral ſucceſſive ones. So that the ſame World is deſtroyed and renewed again according to certain Periods.*

ANSWER.

Of theſe ſeveral Worlds exiſting at one time in divers Regions of the Univerſe, I find no mention, either in that Book under the Name of St. *Ambroſe*, nor in *Porphury*, nor in *Clemens* of *Alexandria*. *Strabo* indeed, *lib.* 15. ſays, *That their Opinion of the World was*, ὅτι γενητὸς ὁ κόσμος καὶ φθαρτὸς καὶ σφαιροειδής. That the World had a Beginning, and was Corruptible and Orbicular; but he hath not a Word of the Multitude of Worlds, nor of their Renovations, nor Periods. The παλιγγενεσία in *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, is the *Metempſychoſis*, and relates not to ſucceſſive Worlds.

Strabo moreover acquaints us; that they did philoſophize about the Immortality of the Soul as *Plato did*; as alſo of the Puniſhments in Hell, which *Strabo* impiouſly calls Fables. But as to his Account of the Opinion of the Modern *Brachmans*, of whom we ſhould have ſo many particulars, ſeems very ſtrange; when our Author, *p.* 79. tells us, *That they are ſaid to conceal their Divinity, and their Opinions in Philoſophy in all kinds, beſides the* μετεμψύχωσις

and ἐποχὴ ἐμψυχῶν. And it must be confessed that these two Opinions were entertained by the ancient *Brachmans*; for there is plain Proof thereof in *Porphury*, and in *Philostratus* in *Photius*'s *Bibliothec*.

The Account we have in *Quintus Curtius*, *lib.* 8. is, That they approved of Self-murther, they worshipped many Gods, and especially Trees for Gods. The Remark of *Curtius* is worth Notice, *Quis credat inter hæc vitia esse curam sapientiæ?* Who can think where there were such Vices, any regard could be had for Philosophy?

What Mr. *Blount* could design by this Section, cannot by me be comprehended; his Arguments have little strength; and supposing they were convincing, yet nothing could from thence be collected worthy of Observation.

Pag. 87. *We have a Letter to Dr.* Sydenham, *where he writes of the* Deists *Arguments, and says,* That human Reason is like a Pitcher with two Ears, and may be taken on either side.

ANSWER.

What he writes of hnman Reason, in comparing of it to a Pitcher with two Ears, may be allowed, and gives us some Light how to behold his Oracles as we ought; for most of them have two Handles, and are proposed (as the Devils Oracles were of Old) full of Ambiguity; *Epictetus* in his *Enchiridion*, *c.* 65. says, πᾶ

πράγ

πράγμα δύο ἔχει λαβάς ; every thing hath two Handles ; Reaſon certainly hath ſo. And from hence we may infer what a bad Foundation it is in Matters of Religion. The neceſſity of revealed Religion from hence appears, as alſo doth the little Support we can have from that which is commonly called Natural.

In a Word, This Aſſertion of Mr. *Blount*'s is both a ſufficient Reproof to the Vainglorious Title of his Book, and ſubverts the very deſign for which it was written,

Pag. 87. *Tho'* Deiſm *is a good manuring of a Man's Conſcience, yet certainly if ſowed with Chriſtianity, it will produce the moſt profitable Crop.*

ANSWER.

This Aſſertion is very abſurd ; for *Chriſtianity* and *Deiſm* are wholly inconſiſtent ; the one ſuppoſing the neceſſity of a Mediator, the other renounces it, and accounts all Mediatorſhip with reſpect to God unneceſſary. So that ſuppoſing *Deiſm*, the very Eſſence of *Chriſtianity* is deſtroyed ; ſo ridiculous is it to talk of ſowing *Chriſtianity* on a Conſcience manured with *Deiſm*.

SECT. V.

Of the Deiſts *Religion.*

PAg. 88. and 89. *The* Deiſts *Religion is firſt negative: God is not to be worſhipt by an Image, nor by Sacrifice—the poſitive is, by an inviolable adherence in our lives, to all the things* φύσει δίκαια, *by an imitation of God, in all His imitable Perfections; eſpecially in His Goodneſs, and believing magnificently of Him.*

ANSWER.

As to the negative Religion of the *Deiſt*, we confeſs, That in the two firſt negatives, we have no controverſy with them, in the ſenſe they are here propoſed. For we acknowledge, There ought not to be made any materialImage of God; neither ought God to be worſhipped by any Sacrifice of any bruit Creature: but that God's infinite Mercy excludes a Mediatour, that we deny. The whole Syſtem of Chriſtian Religion requires our Belief thereof: and therefore, as we have ſaid in the end of the foregoing Section, the *Deiſt* is repugnant to Himſelf, when He ſuppoſeth ſome advantage from Chriſtianity; and yet wholly rejects the grand *Hypotheſis*, upon which it is built.

As

As to the positive Proposition, we say, It is defective, and leaves us in great uncertainties. *Cornelius Agrippa, de vanitate Scientiarum, c.* 54. truly affirms, *Quod aliquando vitium fuit, modo virtus habetur; quod hic virtus est, alibi vitium sit, quod uni honestum, alteri turpe; quod nobis justum, aliis injustum: apud* Athenienses *licuit viro sororem germanam habere in Matrimonio, apud* Romanos *nefas habetur:* 'That which hath at some 'times been accounted a vice, is now account-'ed a vertue; that which in this Country is 'accounted a vertue, in another is accounted 'a vice; among the *Athenians* it was lawful 'for a man to marry his own Sister, which by 'the *Romans* was abominated; and much more 'hath *Agrippa* to the same purpose: that of *Lu-'can* concerning the *Parthians*, is unknown to 'none: *Cui fas implere parentem quid reor esse nefas:* 'Nothing in Nature can be thought to be 'unjust to that man, who thinks he may law-'fully lie with his own Mother. *Julius Firmicus*, in his Epistle to *Lollian*, gives also this Instance, *Apud Ægyptios & Lacedæmonios furari honorificum, apud nos furca suspensi strangulantur.* 'Among the *Egyptians* and *Lacedemonians* it is not 'only accounted lawful, but honourable to com-'mit theft; but with us 'tis punished with death. *Diogenes Laertius vita Pyrrhonis,*——τὸν γοῦν αὐτὸ ϖαρ', οἷς μὲν δικαιον,' οἷς δὲ ἀδικον, καὶ ἄλλοις μὲν ἀγαθὸν, ἄλλοις δὲ κακὸν—— And so he goes on, instancing in particulars, that which is allowed by those to be just, is condemned by

others as unjuſt; that which by ſome is accounted good, by others is accounted evil: The *Perſians* think it lawful to lie with their own Daughters; the *Greeks* deteſt it. The *Maſſagetes* have Wives in common, &c. the *Greeks* abhor it: The *Cilicians* think Robberies to be lawful; 'tis otherwiſe with the *Greeks*: And much more is to be found in the ſame *Laertius* to this effect.

Out of which 'tis manifeſt, what a blind guide Nature is in matters of Religion: how vain the Religion of the *Deiſt* is, and what neceſſity there is of Divine Revelation.

What our Author adds of the Imitation of God in all His imitable Perfections, and eſpecially in His Goodneſs, and believing magnificently of it, deſtroys His *Hypotheſis*, and ſuppoſes revealed Religion: And I appeal to the *Reader*, whether Mr. *Blount* can think magnificently of the Goodneſs of *God*, when He and His *Deiſt* affirm, *That a Mediator derogates from the Infinite Mercy of* God, *equally as an Image doth from His Spirituality and Infinity.* And that not by the by, but openly in the Chapter where the Articles of the Religion of the *Deiſt* are treated of, there it is where this Poſition is laid down: for this is the third Article; ——'Not by a Mediator, for it is un-'neceſſary, and derogates as much from *God*'s 'Mercy, as an Image doth from His Spirituality 'and Infinity. The Repugnancy of which to Holy Scripture, appears from the Firſt of *Timothy*, 2. Chap. v. 5. 'For there is one *God*, 'and

'and one Mediatour between *God* and Men, the 'Man *Chriſt Jeſus:* Our Lord is alſo called Me-'diatour of a better Covenant, *Hebr.* 8. 6. the 'Mediatour of the New Teſtament, *Heb.*9. v.15. And the Mercy of God is frequently declared by His ſending a Mediatour. So that the *Deiſt*'s Religion bids defiance to Chriſtian Religion; and yet now and then He expreſſes ſome regard for the ſame; which overcomes all Impudence, unleſs He owns that the *Deiſt*'s Religion is made up of Contradictions.

Pag. 91. *To be ſure the* Deiſt *is no Idolater; the* Jew *and the* Mahometan *accuſe the* Chriſtian *of Idolatry; the Reformed Churches, the* Roman; *the* Socinian, *the other Reformed Churches; the* Deiſts, *the* Socinian *for his* Deus factus: *but none can accuſe the* Deiſt *for Idolatry, for He only acknowledges one ſupream everlaſting God, and thinks magnificiently of Him.*

ANSWER.

The *Immortal Deiſt* (as our Author calls him, *p.* 95.) had good reaſon thus to boaſt, if He alone were free from Idolatry.

His Poſition may be true; His *Logical* Inference is faulty: For there is not one here mentioned, neither *Romaniſt*, *Reformed*, or *Socinian*, but will *ackowledge one Supream everlaſting God, and thinks magnificently of him.* So that if any of the forenamed may be Idolaters, notwithſtanding

ing

ing this ackowledgment, what ſhould hinder but that our immortal *Deiſt*s may be ſo too?

Dr. *Pearſon* in his Expoſition on the Creed, Article the firſt, ſays, That to imagine the Univerſe to be infinite, and eternal, is to imagine it to be God; the Conſequence is unavoidable.

That great *Deiſt* Pliny, begins his Natural Hiſtory in theſe words. *Mundum numen eſſe credi par eſt, æternum, immenſum, neque genitum, neque interiturum unquam*; 'It is fit to be believed that 'the World is God, eternal, immenſe, having 'neither beginning, nor end.

That this is the opinion of our Modern *Deiſts*, theſe Oracles of Reaſon prove: for in the Title Page of the Book we find it laid down as the the 16th. Oracle, *That the World is eternal.*

So that 'tis eaſy to be perceived, how ungrounded this Vaunting of our *Deiſt* is: and that He will find it more difficult to purge Himſelf of Idolatry, than to faſten it on others.

Doctor *More* indeed in his Apologetical Epiſtle for the *Carteſian* Philoſophy, (*p.* 4.) peremptorily aſſerts, That there were always, and even now, that there are ſome, who ſeriouſly conjoyn this Opinion of the Independency and Eternity of Matter, with the Religious Worſhip of God: But then the Dr. adds, 'That this 'is inconſiſtent with the true Notion of God: 'and in truth it is in Scripture language, halting 'between *God* and *Baal*, which include *Ido-* 'latry.

That

That the Infinity of the World introduces a Duality of God, is rightly inferr'd by the great *Scaliger* in his 359. *Exerc. cont. Cardanum*—*Infiniti menſura nulla eſt; duo infinita nequeunt eſſe; neque in natura, neque extra naturam, eſſent enim duo principia prima:* 'An Infinite cannot be mea-'ſured, wherefore there cannot be two Infinites; 'Equality is the formal Reaſon of Commenſu-'ration. And yet the *Deiſt* makes both God and the World Infinite.

The *Deiſt* acknowledges here in words, That there is one Supreme *God*; yet He cannot ſay this upon any firm Principle, becauſe (*p.* 192.) He ſays, 'If *Geneſis* be but a Parable, the *Per-'ſians* may be in the right, as well as the *Jews*; Which is in effect to ſay, That they who believe and worſhip two contrary Gods, with two contrary Services, as the *Perſians* did, according to the appointment of their *Zoroaſter* (who was 5000 Years ancienter than the *Trojan* War, if you will believe their fabulous Chronology) may be as much in the right as thoſe, who believe one only God. To ſuch Repugnances Men are obnoxious, who defend untruths: and to thoſe may be apply'd that of the Apoſtle (in the 2 Ep. *Theſ.* c. 2. ver. 11.) *And for this cauſe God ſhall ſend them ſtrong deluſions, that they ſhould believe a lie.*

Saint *Auſtin* in the fourth of his Confeſſions, chap. 7. ſpeaking of the miſerable condition He was in, when a *Manichee*, breaks out into this Expreſſion, ——*Non enim tu eras, ſed tantum phantaſma, & error meus erat Deus meus:* 'Not 'thou,

'thou, O Lord, but a vain phantaſm, and my 'error was then my God.——How appoſitely and truly this may be apply'd to the *Deiſt*, the *Reader* cannot but perceive; and would to God it might be apply'd, not only to them, with reſpect to their Error; but alſo with reſpect to their *Converſion.*

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Concerning the Arrians, Trinitarians, *and Councils.*

PAg. 97. *How grateful this Diſcourſe of yours will be to the* Quicunque Men, *I ſhall not preſume to determine, ſince I am ſure Mr.* Hobbs *is as much above their Anger, as they are below his Reſentments.*

ANSWER.

With what Contempt doth He here treat the Eccleſiaſticks of the Church of *England?* Theſe are the *Quicunque Men* that here meant.

As to His Opinion of them, in this His odious Compariſon between Mr. *Hobbs* (whom He ſo much honours, as p. 16. to call Him the great Modern Philoſopher of this Nation) and them; I need ſay no more than this, —That the moſt partial *Reader* muſt be convinced, that no Man can, or hath been more plainly refuted, than Mr. *Hobbs* hath been by our *Quicunque Men:* to omit others, our moſt Reverend Archbiſhop's Book, call'd *Hobbs* His Creed, and Dr. *Templer's* Idea of the *Theology* of the *Leviathan*, are Demonſtrations.

Pag.

Pag. 98. Conſtantine *at firſt eſpouſed the* Arrian *Intereſt, to mount the Throne, as the preſent* Lewis *the XIV. did the Intereſt of the* Hugonots.

ANSWER.

What ground or Authority our *Immortal* Deiſt might have for this His Aſſertion, I do not know; I believe it is a Dream of His own. I am confident no *Chronologer* of any repute could affirm ſo great a Falſity, nothing is more notorious, both in Ancient and Modern Hiſtory, than that *Conſtantine* mounted the Throne, before *Arius* himſelf; much leſs the *Arians* made any conſiderable figure in the World. Perhaps the *odium* He thought might reflect on *Conſtantine*, by the Compariſon of *Lewis* the XIV. prompted Him to commit ſo palpable an Error. Had there been any truth in this Imputation, it cannot be imagined, that the *Arian* Hiſtorian *Philoſorgius* would have paſt it in ſilence; who only ſays, That when *Conſtantius* was dead and buried, that *Conſtantine* βασιλείας κατέσχε διάδοχος *Connſtantine* was His Succeſſor in the Empire.

Pag. 98. *If you will believe the Learned* Petavius, *and other* Arians, *they did offer to be try'd by the Fathers that preceded the* Nicene *Councel.*

A N-

ANSWER.

Petavius is a late Author, and unleſs he brings Proof for what he ſays, he is not to be relied on in hiſtorical Matters of ſo remote Antiquity. *Sandius* in his *Nucleus*, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. p.* 256. cites our Biſhop *Taylor* to the ſame purpoſe, *viz.* That the *Arians* appealed to the Fathers for Trial, and that the Offer was declined.

To which our learned Dr. *Gardiner* in the Appendix *ad Nucleum*, makes this Anſwer, *Ego vero a reverendi Tayleri manibus venia petita, fateor me Socratis & Zozomeni verbis potius aſſenteri*, &c. I for my part am forced to beg Biſhop *Taylor*'s Pardon, and do confeſs, that I aſſent rather to *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, who report the contrary. Which Anſwer is good and valid.

The Biſhops that lived in thoſe Days were far enough from declining Trial by the Fathers, that preceded the *Nicene* Council, that they deſired nothing more. The *Arians* were the Men (as *Socrates* ſays, *lib.* 5. *c.* 10.) that truſted to διαλεξει μόνη κὶ ȣκ ἀρχαίων ἐκθέσει. They were the Men that refuſed the Judgments of the Ancients, and defended themſelves by Niceties and Diſputations. And to the ſame purpoſe *Sozomen*, *lib.* 7. *c.* 12.

I will cite two or three Authorities more, which will make this thing ſo very plain, that nothing but reading Fathers at ſecond hand, and

and too great Credulity can apologize for Mr. *Blount.*

Athanasius is known to be a Bishop, who made as great a Figure in the Church as any one in his time; a Man of great Learning, and exemplary Piety, and one that was as well acquainted with the Methods that the Orthodox and *Arians* made use of, as any Man could possibly be. This great *Athanasius*, in his Book of the Decrees of the *Nicene* Synod, says,

Ἰδὲ ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐκ πατέρων εἰς πατέρας θυαβεβηκέναι τὴν τοιαύτην διάνοιαν ἀποδεικνύομεν; ὑμεῖς δὲ ὦ νέοι Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ τῶ καίαφα μαθηταὶ, τίνας ἀρα τῶν, ἐκμάτων ὑμῶν ἔχετε λείζαι πατέρας; ἀλλα δολένα τῶν φρονίμων ἢ σοφῶν ἄν εἴποιτε. πάντες γάρ ὑμας ἀποστρέφονται, πλὴν μόιε τῶ διαβόλε. μόνῳ γάρ ὑμῖν ὅδε τοιαυτης ἀποστασίας πατὴρ γέγονεν. Behold, we have demonstrated this our Opinion from Fathers to Fathers, as they delivered the same to us. But for your parts, O new Jews and Disciples of *Caiaphas*! What Fathers can you produce that are Fautors of your Heresies? Truly ye cannot bring so much as one of the number of those who were accounted Prudent and Wise, all such detest you. Ye can alledge none but your Father the Devil, who was the sole Author of this Heresie and Defection from the Truth.

Alexander, Bishop of *Alexandria*, a Person in nothing inferior to *Athanasius*; one that had all the Qualifications desireable in a good Prelate.

late. In an Epistle of his to *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*, (as we find it in *Theodoret's* Ecclesiastical History, Book the first, Chapter fourth) says, οὐδὲ γὰρ τῶν ἀρχαίων τινὰς συνηνέγκειν ἑαυτοῖς ἀξιοῦσιν, οὐδὲ οἷς ἡμεῖς ἐν παίδων ἡλικίᾳ μεμελετήκαμεν διδασκάλοις, ἐξισοῦσθαι ἀνέχονται. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν νῦν παντάπασι συλλειτουργῶν τινὰ εἰς μέσον σοφίας ἠγοῦνται. Μόνοι σοφοὶ καὶ ἀκτεμονέστατοι καὶ δογμάτων εὑρηταὶ χέγοντες εἶναι, καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀποκεκαλύφθαι μόνοις, ἅπερ οὐδενὶ τῶν ὑπὸ ἥλιον ἑτέρῳ πέφυκεν ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἔννοιαν.

You *Arians* have so good Opinion of your selves, as that you think none of the Ancients are worthy to be compared to you. Neither will ye endure, that those who in my younger Days were esteemed as our Guides and Masters, should upon any Terms be equalled to you. Neither will ye grant that any of our present Colleagues have any competent Knowledge of these Controversies. Ye think your selves to be the only wise Men; and that although ye have nothing, yet ye enjoy all things. You boast, that you alone are the finders out and possessors of Truth; and that to you such Mysteries are revealed, and kept from other Men.

By which Words *Alexander* of *Alexandria* signifies, that the *Arian* Sentiments were repugnant to the Doctrine of the most ancient Fathers, to the Doctrine of his immediate Predecessors, and of all those Bishops who had the

Government of the Church, when this unhappy *Arian* Hereſy began. He ſignifies alſo, that the firſt Defenders of *Arianiſm* were Enthuſiaſts, and pretenders to extraordinary Revelation.

To theſe two, I will only add St. *Auſtin*, who treating of the bleſſed Trinity at large in fifteen Books, in his firſt Book, Chapter the 3d. he delivers his Mind as fully, and as much to the purpoſe, as either of the two before quoted: Thus he ſays, *Omnes quos legere potui qui ante me ſcripſerunt de Trinitate, divinorum librorum veterum & novorum Catholici tractatores, hoc intenderunt ſecundum Scripturas docere, quod pater & filius & ſpiritus ſanctus unius ejuſdemque ſubſtantiæ inſeparabili æqualitate divinam inſinuent unitatem.*

All the Authors that I have met with, who have written before me of the holy Trinity; all the Orthodox Writers and Commentators of the Divine Books of the Old and New Teſtament propoſed this to themſelves, to prove, that according to the Holy Scriptures, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, have one and the ſame Subſtance, which includes a Divine Unity with an inſeparable Equality.

This laſt Teſtimony of St. *Auſtin* is very remarkable, and as comprehenſive as the moſt zealous *Trinitarian* could deſire. And from hence we cannot but obſerve, how blameworthy ſome very learned Men of the Roman Communion have been; who, though they ſincerely believe the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, yet

yet by affirming, either by miſtake or deſign, that this heavenly Doctrine cannot be proved by Scripture, nor by the Fathers that preceded the *Nicene* Council, but only by unwritten Tradition they have given great advantage to the *Antitrinitarian* to triumph, and have confirmed them in their Heterodox Opinion, *nempe hoc vult Ithacus, magno & mercantur Achivi.*

Pag. 98. *For at that Council the Arians were rather condemn'd by a Party, than by the General Conſent of the Chriſtian Church: becauſe* Conſtantine, *out of above two Thouſand Biſhops then Aſſembled, excluded all but Three hundred and Eighteen; nor were thoſe perhaps (for Accounts vary) all Biſhops that made up this great Council.*

ANSWER.

This is a heavy Charge againſt the *Nicene* Council; it had been but reaſonable that the *Immortal Deiſt* ſhould have ſhowed the Grounds which he had for this Accuſation: No Truth nor Innocence can be ſufficient, if an Acculation goes for Proof.

He that ſhould read the ancient View of Biſhopricks in *Aubertus Miræus*, or the Sacred Geography of *Carolus a Sancto Paulo*, would give little Credit to this Charge, for he would not find half that number of Biſhopricks in the Chriſtian World.

We confeſs there is ſome difference among ancient Authors as to the preciſe Number of Biſhops in the *Nicene* Synod, but then the difference is very inconſiderable, not ſo portentous and extravagant, as it is here repreſented; nor a Word of this pretended Project of *Conſtantine*'s.

Athanaſius, *Hilary*, *Hierom Ruffin*, *Socrates*, and others affirm the Number of the Council to be 318. 'Tis true, there were many Preſbyters and Deacons that accompanied theſe Biſhops, of whom theſe Authors make no particular mention, there being no ſuch regard had of them, as there was of the Biſhops.

I am verily perſwaded, that what Mr. *Selden* ſays in his Commentary on *Eutychius*, *p.* 81. will obtain Belief among all unprejudiced Perſons; I will therefore report in his own Words, *Nemo mihi Sancto Athanaſio æquiparandus, is ſcilicet Archidiaconus tunc Eccleſiæ Alexandrinæ cum Alexandro patriarcha ſuo, cui proxime ſucceſſit; teſtis interfuit oculatus. Atque diſerte is in Epiſtola ad Epiſcopos Africanos.* ἡ διακονικὴ γέγονεν ἡ ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδος τριακοσίων δεκαὰ καὶ ὀκτὼ συνελθόντων Ἐπισκόπων.

No one in my Opinion, as to this Matter, is to be compared to *Athanaſius*; he was Archdeacon of the Church of *Alexandria*, an Eye Witneſs, and immediate Succeſſor to *Alexander* the Patriarch, and he expreſly writes in an Epiſtle of his to the *African* Biſhops, *That in the Synod held at* Nice, *there were aſſembled Three hundred and eighteen Biſhops.*

There

There is an ancient Author, who wrote a Book about the time of the fourth general Council held at *Chalcedon*, One hundred and twenty Years after that at *Nice*. The Title of the Book is, *An Expoſition and Collection of all the ſaid Synods.*

This Book was brought into *England* in Manuſcript, together with many other Manuſcripts of great Value, by *Chriſtian Ravius*, a German, a Man very well verſed in the Oriental Learning: This Book gives us an account much differing from Mr. *Blount's*. He ſays, *There were* 232 *Biſhops in the Council, Presbyters and Monks* 86, *in all* 318. Here is no mention of 2000 Biſhops, nor of any Artifice of *Conſtantine's*.

And this is the more to be regarded, if it be true what *Sandius* the *Arian* Hiſtoriographer imagines, *p* 166. that the Author of this Collection was *Sabinus* the Macedonian, who wrote a Book of the ſame Title. *Socrates* aſſures us that this Hiſtory was written with great Partiality, being an Enemy to that Council, and one that accuſed the Fathers thereof, as ſimple and ignorant Perſons, for which he is reproved by the ſame *Socrates, lib.* 1. *c.* 6. and *lib.* 2. *c.* 13. How glad would *Sabinus* have been to have laid hold on this occaſion to blacken *Conſtantine* and this Synod, had there been the leaſt Colour of Truth for ſo horrid a Calumny.

Perhaps ſome may think that Mr. *Blount* had ſomd good Grounds for laying this Imputation on *Conſtantine* and the Council, although he did not produce them, and would therefore be willingly ſatisfied, what Conjectures may be made in order thereunto.

For the ſatisfaction of ſuch, I make this Anſwer, That I believe Mr. *Blount* had no Grounds, but ſuch only as we find cited in *Sandius* and *Selden*. In the firſt we find out of *Hottinger* in his Oriental Hiſtory, *viz.* That *Petricides* and *Elmæ Cinus*, Arabian Writers, have delivered to Poſterity, that there were at *Nice* 2300, which in truth can make nothing for Mr. *Blount*, the Queſtion was of Biſhops only, not of Others. For *Socrates*, *lib.* 1. *c.* 5. *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* ſays, that there were at this Council Presbyters, Deacons, and of other inferior Orders innumerable. And I find this of *Socrates* to be very agreeable with that which is delivered by other Hiſtorians of that Age; and which peradventure might give the firſt occaſion of this exorbitant number of Biſhops. And if we may be allowed to conſult Reaſon in hiſtorical Marters, I cannot do better then to cite *Nicetas Coniates*, *lib.* 5. *c.* 9. where he gives this Reaſon why no more Biſhops met in ſo venerable an Aſſembly, becauſe Age and Sickneſs detained many, and that Biſhopricks were then thin ſowed, every little City being not then advanced into an Epiſcopal See.

In

In *Selden* we find *Eutychius* affirming, that in the City of *Nice* were aſſembled 2400 Biſhops. According to Dr. *Pocock*'s Tranſlation, *Joſephus Ægyptius* affirms the number to be 2048. And the ſame is affirmed by *Iſmael Ibn Ali*, the Mahometan Hiſtorian. Theſe are the only Authors that I have any where obſerved to have been made uſe of by learned Men to this purpoſe.

To all which the Novelty of the Author is a ſufficient Anſwer. Certainly thoſe Hiſtorians who liv'd in the Age when things are tranſacted, and are Eye-witneſſes, and are a great part of the Affairs themſelves, are to be believed before others, that lived ſome hundred of Years after the things were done.

But ſince *Iſmael Ibn Ali* the Mahometan, ſeems more full to Mr. *Blount*'s purpoſe than the others, I will here tranſlate him.

About the End of the twentieth Year of *Conſtantine* the Emperor, there were gathered together in Council 2048 Biſhops; then the Emperor choſe out of that number 318. And they did Excommunicate *Arius* of *Alexandria*, becauſe he did aſſert that Chriſt was a Creature. The foreſaid Biſhops were conſenting to the Emperor's Pleaſure, and ſo they innovated and publiſhed a New Syſtem of Chriſtian Religion.

Euſebius, who lived in thoſe Days, and was a Member of the Council, ſays in his Chronicle, that the *Vicennalia* of *Conſtantine* were Celebrated at *Rome*, Anno 330. and that the Council was aſſembled Anno 325. So that this Trip of the Mahometans is an Argument that he made uſe of bad Records in compiling his Hiſtory. And whereas he ſays the Council innovated as to Religion, he writes like a Mahometan indeed, and not like a Man acquainted with the Miſteries of our Sacred Religion,

We have therefore reaſon to believe, that as the Arabic Canons, falſly fathered on this Council, are exploded by all that have any Guſt of Criticiſm; ſo likewiſe will theſe Modern Arabic Pamphlets be rejected by all ſuch as will take the Pains to examine them.

Pag. 99. *The Arians had not the Freedom to diſpute their Cauſe in the Council of* Nice.

ANSWER.

If this could be made appear, then farewell to the Authority of the *Nicene* Council; but if this be falſe (as undoubtedly it is) what a horrid injury is done to this moſt Venerable Aſſembly? This is one of the greateſt Objections the *Proteſtants* have againſt the Council of *Trent*, and that the *Catholicks* of old had againſt the *Arian* Synods: but who can believe this, that knows with what fervency and zeal Saint *Athanaſius* declaims againſt

againſt this perverſe Method? And this Method He ſays is repugnant to the Law of God, and the Bleſſed Apoſtle. *Athanaſius Apol. ad Conſt. Imper.* τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ θεῖος νόμος κελεύει, τοῦτο ὁ μακάριος Ἀπόστολος. *The divine Law, and the Bleſſed Apoſtle require and Command all parties to be heard:* And to this purpoſe He quotes *Acts* 24 ver. 19. *who ought to have been before thee, and object if they had ought againſt me —— or elſe let theſe ſame here ſay if they have found any evil doing in me, whilſt I ſtood before the Council.* And he quotes the 25.

'About whom, when I was at *Jeruſalem*, the 'chief Prieſts, and the Elders of the *Jews* inform-'ed me, deſiring to have judgment againſt him. ——to whom I anſwered, 'It is not the manner 'of the *Romans* to deliver any man to die, before 'that he which is accuſed, have the accuſers face 'to face, and have licence to anſwer for him-'ſelf concerning the crime laid againſt him.

Can it now be poſſibly conceived, that *Athanaſius* ſhould thus expoſe himſelf, and the Sacred Synod, as He muſt of neceſſity have done, if either He or they had been obnoxious to the ſame charge?

Sozomen, lib. 1. *c.* 15. *Eccleſ. Hiſtor.* συνιόντες οἱ ἐπίσκοποι μεταπαλῶνται τὸν Ἄρειον, καὶ προτιθεμένων εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐδόξασον, διελέγοντο. 'When the Biſhops were aſſembled together, 'they ſent for *Arius*, and propoſed his Opinion 'to be diſputed and diſcuſſed.

Socrates, lib. 1. *c.* 5. Τὴν μὲν Ἀρείου δόξαν συνεκόρουσεν Εὐσέβιος ὁ Νικομήδειας, θεογνὶς καὶ μάρις τοῖς

τοῖς γενναίως ἀντηγωνίζετο Ἀθανάσιος. 'The 'Opinion of *Arius* was defended by *Euſebius* Bi-'ſhop of *Nicomede*, by *Theognis* Biſhop of *Nice*, 'by *Maris* Biſhop of *Chalcedon* in *Bithynia*; who 'were oppoſed with great zeal by *Athanaſius* a 'Deacon of the Church of *Alexandria*.

Theodoret lib. 1. c. 7. 'I have formerly made 'mention of ſome who in the Council defended 'the cauſe of *Arius*: beſides thoſe, *Menophantus* 'of *Epheſus*, *Patrophilus* of *Scythopolis*, *Theognis* 'of *Nice*, *Narciſſus* of *Neroniad* (this *Neroniad* is a City of the other *Cilicia*, now called *Irenopolis*) 'Theonas of *Marmarita*, *Secundus* of Pto-'lemais, a City of *Egypt*, oppoſed the *Catholick* 'Faith, and took on them the Defenſe and Pa-'tronage of *Arius*.

Ruffinus lib 1.c. 2. 'For many days there was 'a great diſpute in the Council, where ſome ve-'hemently favoured *Arius*, and contended for 'his Doctrines.

Who can now believe, after ſuch a cloud of of Witneſſes, that there ſhould be the leaſt Mite of truth in this Poſition of Mr. *Blount*'s, *That the* Arians *had not the freedom to diſpute their cauſe at the Council of* Nice.

What ſhould occaſion this grand Miſtake in our *Deiſt*, may without great difficulty be conjectured: I do not find any ground for it in the *Arabian* Hiſtorians before mentioned; but in that impudent Writer *Sandius*, pag 167. I find the whole charge: For there He affirms, That *Arius* and his Complices were cenſured, judged, and con-

condemned, *cauſa inaudita multo minus rationibus expenſis: They were condemned*, ſays He, *without being heard*; much leſs had they permiſſion to produce their Arguments and Reaſons. And that which overcomes all Impudence, is, that the ſaid *Sandius* for proof, cites *Socrates*, *Theodoret*, and *Athanaſius* himſelf; whereas there is nothing in thoſe Authors but makes againſt Him; for the places I have cited, I have viewed in the Original.

Upon the whole, this plainly appears, that *Arius* was cited before the Fathers in the Council, His Propoſitions were debated, His cauſe was eſpouſed by ſome in the Council with much zeal; every thing on either ſide was weighed with great deliberation, that nothing might be raſhly concluded in ſo weighty and important an Affair.

Pag. 99. *The* Arian *Doctrine was not only confirmed by eight Councils, ſeveral times aſſembled at* Tyre, Sardis, Syrmium, Millain, Seleucia, Nice, Tarſis, *and particularly at* Ariminum (*where ſix hundred Biſhops were of their opinion, with only three which held the contrary*) *they alſo puniſhed others who were of a contrary opinion, with Confiſcations, Baniſhments, and other grievous Puniſhments.*

ANSWER.

The *Arian* Doctrine, according to *Athanaſius*, was confirmed πλέον συνόδοις καὶ πλέον, *The* Arian *Doctrine was confirmed by ten Synods, and more:*

Nei-

Neither is this any wonder, for the *Arians* had for a long time the Sun-ſhine of the Secular Power. The Queſtion then is not of the Number of Synods, but of the Methods by which they did proceed: As to the *Arian* Methods, we have this account from *Athanaſius*; 'All their Coun-'cils were διὰ μίσους ἦ, φιλονεικίαν ἐκ βίας συγ-κροτηθείσαι, 'All the Methods they took were 'irregular; they were grounded on Hatred, Am-'bition, and Violence: and this made their Coun-'cils void to all intents and purpoſes.

And as to the Council of *Ariminum*, He ſays, κατ' φιλονεικίαν καὶ βίαν συντίθεντα, *Things were there determined by ambition and violence.* Nay He is ſo poſitive, as to this of *Ariminum*, that he plainly ſays, That the Advocates thereof, μὴ εἰδέναι τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ πραχθέντα, ἢ δ' ἀνέσιώπησαν, 'That if the Advocates of that Council did but 'know how irregular the Proceedings at *Arimi-'num* were, they would be ſilent, and not plead 'for it. So charitable was this good Man, that altho' the *Arians* perſecuted Him cauſeleſly, with all imaginable malice and wickedneſs, yet He could not think that they would proceed to ſuch boldneſs, as openly to defend ſuch notoriouſly unjuſtifiable courſes.

As to the Number of Biſhops pretended to be preſent at the Council of *Ariminum*, there is ſome difference between our Author, and *Sandius*: the latter making the Number to be a thouſand or more: *Interea qui* Arimini *convenerunt Pontifices numero millenarium excedente fuerunt.* And this

Hu-

Hunerick teſtifies in *Victor. Uticen.* lib. 3. *I have conſulted the place, and can avouch for* Sandius, *that he hath rightly cited* Victor. Utic. For thus it is in the Bibliotheck of the Fathers: But the Authority of *Hunerick* is of no moment. He was an *Arian* Prince, a *Vandal*; and one who to carry on deſigns, would not confine himſelf to numbers: and peradventure the conſideration thereof might move Mr. *Blount* to make allowance, and to confine Himſelf to ſix hundred; a very competent number and more than I am willing to acknowledge. For I cannot but think that they are both out of the way; ſince *Sulpitius Severus*, an ancient Author, and one that had many conveniences of knowing the truth, much better than either of them, aſſures us that there were very few above four hundred; *Quadringenti & aliquot amplius*, are the words of *Sulpitius Severus*, *lib.* 2. *Hiſt. Sacra.* And whereas Mr. *Blount* ſays, That out of the number of ſix hundred, there were only *three that diſſented*; he is under a great miſtake: and to make it very plain, I ſhall cite *Theodoret* lib. 2. *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* cap. 23. where we find what here follows.

The Great Athanaſius *in his Epiſtle to the* Africans, *writes after this manner of the Council of* Ariminum, 'Who can bear with them who prefer the Council of *Ariminum* before that of *Nice?* or rather who cannot but hate ſuch, as reject the Decrees of thoſe at *Nice*, and are in love with ſuch as were extorted *by force and violence at* Ariminum? It happens to ſuch as it hap-

'pened

'pened to the *Jews*, accordingly as it is written 'by the Prophet, *They have forſaken the fountain 'of living waters, and have digged to themſelves 'broken ciſterns, that cannot hold water.* So theſe 'Men leaving the Sacred *Nicene* Council, have 'betaken themſelves to many *Synods*, which are in 'themſelves vain, and of no effect. And yet at *Ariminum* there were no leſs than two hundred Diſſenters; and not three only (as Mr. *Blount* bears us in hand) that held the contrary.

As to what is added concerning the Perſecutions uſed by the *Arians*, we own it to be true; and the Orthodox frequently inveighed againſt the *Arians* for theſe their Barbarities. I ſhall therefore acquaint my *Reader* what *Grotius* ſays, *lib* 2. *De Jur. Pacis & Belli, cap.* 21. *ſect.* 5. Athanaſius *is very vehement againſt the* Arian *Hereſy*; *for in his* Epiſt. ad Solit. *they were the firſt who made uſe of the Temporal Power to puniſh diſſenters with* Stripes, *Impriſonments*, *Confiſcations and Baniſhments*, ſays Mr. *Blount*, 'Thoſe Biſhops were 'condemned in *France* by the judgment of the 'Church, which perſecuted the *Priſcillianiſts* to 'death; and in the Eaſt that Synod was con-'demned, which conſented to the *Burning of Bo-'gomilus*.

Page 100. *As for the* Trinitarians *of theſe times, I muſt confeſs that I cannot but eſteem them as enemies to all Humane Learning; for they had Canons forbidding them to read any* Ethnick *Books.*

A N-

ANSWER.

I have ſeldom found ſuch Confidence any where, as theſe Oracles do in all places afford us. How ridiculous this inſulting of Mr. *Blount*'s is, will fully appear in handling this Point. In proſecution of which, I ſhall

Firſt, Lay down the Diſcourſe of Father *Paul* relating hereunto.

Secondly, I ſhall ſhow what Reaſons I have to diſſent from that learned and worthy Perſon.

Thirdly, I ſhall conſult the Opinions of ſome of the moſt Learned of the Eaſtern Church, with my Reaſon for ſo doing.

Laſtly, I ſhall make plain Inferences, which will be ſufficient to cramp the Preſumption of our *Deiſt*, and to defend the *Trinitarians* (as he calls them) againſt the Imputation of Ignorance.

Of what Candor and Learning Father *Paul* was, every Man knows that hath read his Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*; where *p.* 472. he hath this Diſcourſe,

In the Church of Martyrs there was no Eccleſiaſtical Prohibition, though ſome godly Men made Conſci-

Conſcience of reading bad Books, for fear of offending againſt one of the three Points *of the Law of God; to avoid the Contagion of Evil, not to expoſe ones ſelf to Temptations without Neceſſity or Profit; and not to ſpend time vainly. Theſe Laws being Natural, do remain always, and ſhould oblige us to beware of reading bad Books, though there were no Eccleſiaſtical Law for it. But theſe Reſpects ceaſing, the Example of* Dionyſius *Biſhop of* Alexandria, *a famous Doctor did happen, who about the Year of our Lord,* 240. *being reprehended by ſome of his Prieſts for theſe Cauſes, and troubled with theſe Reſpects, had a Viſion that he ſhould read all Books, becauſe he was able to judge of them; yet they thought that there was greater Danger in the Books of the* Gentiles, *than of the* Hereticks; *the reading whereof was more abhorred and reprehended, becauſe it was more uſed by* Chriſtian *Doctors for a vanity of Human Eloquence. For this cauſe St.* Jerom, *either in a Verſion, or in a Sleep, was beaten by the Devil: So that about the Year* 400, *a Council in* Carthage *did forbid to read the Books of the* Gentiles, *but allowed them to read the Books of* Hereticks, *the Decrees whereof is among the Canons, collected by* Gratian, *and this was the firſt Eccleſiaſtical Prohibition by way of Canon.* Thus far *Paul.* And now I come to the ſecond thing.

The Council of *Carthage*, which Father *Paul* relates to, is that which is commonly called the 4th *Carthaginian* Council, whoſe 16th Canon is, —— *ut Epiſcopus Gentilium libros non legat, Hæreticorum*

ticorum autem pro neceſſitate & tempore : 'That 'a Biſhop do not read the Books of the *Gen-* 'tiles; but in reading the Books of *Hereticks*, 'He is to have regard to Neceſſity and Oppor- 'tunity.

Now in this particular, I diſſent from *Paul*, and joyn with that great Antiquary *Juſtellus*, who in his Preface to the Code of the *African* Church, ſays, ——*Concilium quod vocant quartum Carthaginenſe, plane repudiandum eſt, nec fides adhibenda Canonibus* 104 *quos ſine auctoritate hujus Concilio adſcribunt :* 'The Council, which 'is commonly called the fourth *Carthaginian*, 'is to be wholly rejected, neither is there any 'Faith to be given to the 104 Canons, which 'without any good Authority they aſcribe to 'it.

There is no mention of theſe Canons in the Collection of *Ferrandus*; nor in that of *Dionyſius Exiguus*; nor in the Code of the *African* Church; nor in the Collection commonly called the *Afr.* Council. In a Manuſcript that belonged to Cardinal *Barberini*, they are entituled *Ancient Statutes of the Eaſtern Church.* But theſe Canons themſelves prove the contrary. The Ceremonies of the Ordination of the leſſer Orders, as they are ſate forth in this Council, are agreeable enough to the Practice of the Weſtern Church, where theſe Orders were conferred by delivering holy Veſſels; but not to the Eaſtern Church, where theſe Orders were always conferred by Impoſition of Hands. In other Manu-

ſcripts they are entituled, *The ancient Statutes of the Church.* In a word, there can be no ſufficient reaſon given, why they ſhould not be found in the ancient Collections, if they were genuine. The ancienteſt Author Father *Paul* cites is *Gratian*, whoſe teſtimony is of no weight, if not ſtrengthen'd by ſome collateral Evidence: For all know He is a perfect *Rhapſodiſt*, and this is ſo fully made out by *Auguſt. Tarraconenſis*, in his Book *de Emendat. Gratiani*, that there is not any place left for the leaſt doubt. Which prejudice, together with that of Moderneſs, may be objected againſt *Iſidore*, *Burchardus*, *Hincmare*, *Ivo Carnotenſis*, *&c.* and the defence which *Schelſtrate* makes is ſo weak and dull, as that it ſavours little of a *Vaticane* Library keeper: whereas otherwiſe in his *Eccleſia Africana*, He diſcovers much Learning and Reading.

I am now to conſult the Opinions of ſome in the Eaſtern Church, and to bring my reaſon for doing ſo.

Saint *Baſil* in the firſt Tome of his Works, hath a Homily, whoſe Title is, πρὸς τοὺς νεοὺς ὁ τῶς ἐξ Ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῖντο λόγων. This Homily was compos'd for young Men, not to prohibite them to read the Books of the *Gentiles*, but to direct them, and to ſhew what benefit they might reap thereby. Amongſt other things He takes notice that *Moſes* was educated in the Learning of the *Egyptians*; and ſo proceeded to the knowledge of the true God. In like man-

ner

ner in following ages, *Daniel* at *Babylon* learned the Learning of the *Chaldeans*, and from thence proceeded to Divine Doctrines.

Gregory Nazianzen, ad Seleucum Iambic. 3. treats of this matter, where he prohibits nothing as touching reading the Books of the *Gentiles*, but only lays down this Rule, 'That 'from the same Plant Roses may be gathered 'and Thorns, and that we ought to take one, 'and leave the other.

The reason of these two citations is, to stop the mouths of those, who pretend that the Apostles prohibited the reading the Books of the *Gentiles*: and for that purpose quote chap. 5. of the Apostolical Constitutions; whose Title is, περὶ τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι πάντων τῶν ἔξωθεν βιβλίων; concerning reading the Books of such as are not within the pale of the Church.

To which there needs no other Reply, than the Testimonies of these two learned and pious Bishops: 'If there had been such Constitu- 'tions in their times, they could never have 'written as they did. Besides the Authority of these pretended Constitutions, as to this point, is so fully refuted by Mr. *Dalle* in his Book *de Pseudopigr. Apostolicis*, pag. 326. that there is no place left for a Reply.

I may add hereunto the Law of the Emperour *Julian* the Apostate, from *Theodoret Eccles. Hist.* lib. 4. c. 8. He first of all prohibited the use of *Rhetoric*, *Poetry*, and *Philosophick* Arts to the children of the *Galileans* (so he called the

Chriſtians) and the reaſon of the Law is in theſe words: *They wound us with our arrows, as it is in the Proverb; for out of our own Books they borrow argumeurs, which they make uſe of to our confuſion:* And all know this to be true, who have read *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius* and others, in their Controverſies with the *Gentiles.*

The Corollaries and Inferences I ſhall make are very plain: Firſt, I affirm that there is no good Evidence for ſuch a Canon *anno* 400. much leſs Canons, as Mr. *Blount* ſays.

The Second is, That this pretended Canon was made 75 years after the holding of the *Nicene* Council; and therefore our *Deiſt* could not gather from this Canon the Ignorance of the *Trinitarians* of thoſe times.

The Third is, That it cannot be preſumed that the Canons of the Church ſhould be conform to the Decree of the Emperour *Julian*, which was made on purpoſe to eradicate the *Chriſtian* Religion; no more than it can be preſumed, that *Baſil* and *Nazianzen* would impugn an Apoſtolical Conſtitution.

Laſtly, The Learning of the *Gentiles* was ſo amply treated of by the Fathers of the 4 firſt Centuries; their *Philoſophy* and *Theology* was ſo fully examined and refuted by them; that unleſs theſe Books had been prohibited, it was impoſſible for the *Trinitarians* of thoſe times to have been ignorant of all the ſolid Learning contained in the Books of the *Gentiles.*

Pag. 103. *And to ſhew how ignorant the Clergy were in the time of the Emp.* Marcian, *we find the* Greek *Tongue ſo little underſtood at* Rome, *and the* Latin *in* Greece, *that the Biſhops in both Countries (in all 630) were glad to ſpeak by Interpreters. Nay in this very Council at* Chalcedon, *the Emperor was fain to deliver the ſame ſpeech in* Greek *to one party, and in* Latin *to the others, ſo that both might underſtand him: the Council of* Jeruſalem *for the ſame reaſon made certain Creeds, both in* Greek *and* Latin; *at the Council of* Epheſus, *the* Pope's Legats *had their Interpreter to expound the words: and when* Celeſtine's *Letters were there read, the* Acts *tells us how the* Biſhops *deſired to to have them tranſlated into* Greek, *and read over again; inſomuch that the* Romiſh Legats *had almoſt made a controverſy of it, fearing leaſt the* Papal Authority *ſhould have been prejudiced by ſuch an* Act: *alledging therefore, how it was the ancient cuſtom to propoſe the* Bulls *of the See* Apoſtolick *in* Latin *only, and that that might now ſuffice. Whereupon theſe poor* Greek *Biſhops were in danger not to have underſtood the* Pope's *Latin, till at length the* Legats *were content with Reaſons, when it was evidenced to them, That the major part could not underſtand one word of* Latin. *But the pleaſanteſt of all, is* Pope Celeſtine's *Excuſe to* Neſtorius, *for his ſo long delay in anſwering his Letters, becauſe he could not by any means get his* Greek *conſtrued ſooner. Alſo* Pope Gregory *the Firſt ingeniouſly confeſſeth to the Biſhop of* Theſſaly, *that he underſtood not a jot of his* Greek.

ANSWER.

Mr. *Blount* hath diſcovered much malignity againſt the Clergy in this and the next Page; the great Imputation of their not being good *Grecians*, cannot be charged on the preſent Clergy. Beſides we are not ſo ignorant, as He is diſingenuous who hath taken all thoſe choice Remarks, word for word out of *Du Ranchin*'s Review of the Council of *Trent*, p. 151 and 152. and yet makes no mention of the Author, to whom he was ſo much obliged.

What our Author propoſes to Himſelf by this Method, is not very material; for ſince the *Latin* and *Greek* are the Learned Languages, why may not one of them be ſufficient for a Clergy-man? He that hath been in the leaſt concern'd in the *Popiſh* Controverſies, cannot be ignorant that *Caſaubone*, *Rainolds*, *Dalle* and others, have ſufficiently demonſtrated, how unskilful *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* have been in the *Greek* Tongue; and yet who can doubt but that they were deſervedly reputed great Clerks? Who can doubt but that St. *Auſtin*, and the *African* Biſhops were very Pious and Learned Men? and yet how meanly they were skilled in the *Greek* Tongue, I have ſhown in another place. If our Author be delighted with ſuch Inſtances, He might have brought ſome more pertinent to His purpoſe: For *Alphonſus a Caſtro* tells us, there were ſome *Popes* ſo illiterate, as they were totally igno-

ignorant of *Grammar*. *Saint Amour* tells us of a *Pope*, who ſaid, He was a *Canoniſt*, and no *Divine*. The Learned Biſhop of *Sarum*, in the Preface to his *Regale*, acquaints us with a Report at *Rome*, at the Election of a *Pope*, that Cardinal *Albici* ſhould ſay, *For the Love of* God, *let us at leaſt have a* Pope, *that is ſo learned, that He may be able to read the* Goſpel *in the* Maſs. However it be, none of Mr. *Blount*'s Inſtances affect us of the Reformed Church, whom yet I think he purpoſely deſigns to derogate from in his Paragraph: For p. 97. he writes very contemptibly of them; and ſays, 'The *Quicunque* Men (by which he underſtands the Clergy of *England*) are as much below Mr. *Hobbs* his Reſent-'ments, as he is above their Anger. And this he writes near the beginning of this Chapter, where theſe his Proofs are of the Ignorance of the Clergy; but how unjuſt this charge is with reſpect to them is ſo manifeſt, that it would be a madneſſ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~fute him~~. to confute him

SECT VII.

Of the Immortality of the Soul, and the Original of the Jews.

THeſe *Oracles of Reaſon* have nothing remarkable from p. 106 to p. 116. ſave only this, That he borrows whole pages, without any acknowledgment. The Epiſtle to Mr. *Wilwood* is a tranſlation out of *Gaſſendus* third and fourth Chapters of the third part *Syntag. Epic. Philoſ.* his Treatiſe of Beneficence to *Madam*; and his preference of *Plato* and *Pythagoras* to *Ariſtotle*, are either purely Moral, or elſe grounded on the Sentiments of thoſe Philoſophers, with whom we have no mind to conteſt at preſent, about thoſe Points of *Fate* and *Fortune*.

Pag. 117. *Your incomparable Verſion of that paſſage of* Seneca, *where he begins with*—— *Poſt mortem nihil eſt, ipſa & mors nihil:* 'There is 'nothing after death, and Death it ſelf is no-'thing.

And pag. 128. he ſays, *This is* Seneca's *Opinion.*

AN.

ANSWER.

What *Seneca*'s Opinion was of the Immortality of the Soul, cannot be concluded from this paſſage. For he frequently contradicts Himſelf in this particular. And as *Lipſius* in the Third Book of His Stoical Phyſiology obſerves, *aliquando accedit, aliquando recedit*; ſometimes He affirms it, ſometimes He denieth it. In the 36*th* Epiſt. where He commends a certain perſon who removed from unavoidable Troubles in publick Affairs, and comforts Him againſt death, he hath theſe Expreſſions, *Mors quam parti meſcimus & recuſamus intermittit vitam non eripit; venet iterum, qui nos in lucem reponet dies.* Death, which we ſo much fear, may intermit Life; it ſhall not wholly deprive us of it, the day will come which ſhall reſtore us from Death to Life. And if we add what follows (*quem multi recuſarent niſi oblitos reducerent*) his Contradictions in this place will be both viſible and palpable. In his 63*d* Epiſtle, which was a Conſolatory one upon the Death of a Friend; and in the end of that Epiſtle he ſays, *Et fortaſſe (ſi modo ſapientum vera fama eſt, recipit q; nos locus aliquis) quem putamus periiſſe; præmiſſus eſt.* And perhaps our Friend, whom we fear is loſt for ever, is only gone before us. Some wiſe men are of Opinion, that there is a common Receptacle for us all. And this makes *Lipſius*, in his Commentaries on this place,

place, to say, *Dubie & trepide super immortalitate animæ & aliis. Seneca* philosophizes doubtfully of the Immortality of the Soul, as he doth also in other places. And although Mr. *Blount* would in this page perswade us, that *Seneca* is for the Mortality of the Soul, yet p. 124. he confesses the Contradiction himself; where he writes, 'When I hear *Seneca* the Philosopher, 'and others, preaching up the doctrine of the 'Souls Immortality, with a *quid mihi cura erit* '*transfuga?* tackt to the end of it, nothing un-'der Heaven seems to me more unaccountable 'and contradictory?

By which we see what little regard is to be had to the Stoical Philosophers, if you consider them without their moral Sentences. He that hath but the least Skill in Natural Philosophy, cannot but perceive how grosly erroneous they are therein. They who make the great God Corporeal; they who make the Stars to feed on the Vapours of the Earth (in which absurd Notion *Seneca*, with his Rhetorical Flourishes, seems to boast), they who make the Sun to drink up the Waters of the Sea to quench his Thirst, and the Moon to drink up the Rivers; they (I say) who discourse so unphilosophically in these Physical Matters, if they err in the momentous point of the Souls Immortality, it cannot be accounted strange.

Natural Religion being, according to our Author, grounded on the immortality of the Soul; and yet, as it will appear hereafter, that this

this immortality cannot certainly be known but by Scripture and the Parſons harangues (as He, by way of contempt, ſays, p. 118.) and not by the Reaſons of *Philoſophers*; The neceſſity of *Revealed Religion*, muſt be very evident, which our Deiſts Hypotheſis will not allow.

P. 118. *No Subject whatever has more entangled and ruffled the thoughts of the wiſeſt men, than this concerning our future State; it has been controverted in all Ages by men of the greateſt Learning and Parts.*

ANSWER.

The Method Mr. *Blount* proceeds by in concluding from the Immortality of the Soul to future Rewards and Puniſhments, is very good; and I think the Reciprocal Conſequence to be equally true.

The *Sadduces*, as *Joſephus* tells us, *lib.* 18. *Antiq. c.* 2. affirm, τὰς ψυχὰς συναφανίζεσι τοῖς σώμασι. The Souls of men periſh together with their Bodies. And the ſame *Joſephus*, *de bello Judaico*, *p.* 788. affirms, that the *Sadduces* did ψυχῆς δὲ τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς ὑπὸ ᾅδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιρεῖσι. They did deny the Immortality of the Soul, and conſequently Rewards and Puniſhments in the world to come. And in this the *Sadduces* were agreeable to their Principles.

Lu-

Ludovicus Vives, in his excellent Book *De veritate fidei, chap.* 5. lays it down for certain, that whatſomever was affirmed by Philoſophers with reſpect to a future State, *ita ſunt leviter dicta ac frigide, ut non ſatis videantur credere quæ affirmabant.* Whatever they affirmed with reſpect to Rewards for Vertue, or Puniſhments for Vice, was ſo ſlightly aud coldly delivered, as that they ſeem not to believe themſelves. And the ſame Author ſpeaks to the ſame Purpoſe, *chap.* 6. What the Philoſophers declare as to Remunerations after this Life, they do it, *timide & quaſi diffidentur.* They declare their Opinions with Fear and Diffidence.

This Cenſure of *Ludovicus* ſeems to be too mild, as I will exemplifie in ſome Particulars.

Cicero in his Oration *pro Cluentio*, ſpeaking of the Death of a certain Perſon, ſays, *Quid mali mors illi attulerit? Niſi forte in puriis ac fabulis ducimur, ut exiſtimemus illum apud inferos impiorum ſupplicia ſufferre.* What Evil did Death bring to him? certainly none at all, unleſs we give credit to ſuch Fables and Fooleries as we are told befal impious Perſons in another World. And in the firſt Book of his Tuſculane Queſtions, *Quæ anus tam atra quæ timea iſta.*

Acheronſia templa, alta orci, pallida
Leti, obnubila, obſita tenebris loca.

Non

Non pudet Philoſophum in eo gloriari, quod hæc non timeat, & quod falſa eſſe cognoverit. What dreaming Old Woman can be ſo delirious, as to be afraid of *Acheron*'s Temples, of the Principalities of Hell, of pale Death, of the cloudy and dark Palaces below? It is a ſhame for a Philoſopher to boaſt that he doth not fear theſe things, for he knows that they are meer Cheats.

As for *Pythagoras*, we have his Opinion in *Ovid*'s Metamorphoſis; — *Quid Styga, quid tenebras, quid nomina vana timemus?* Why ſhould we be ſo vain, as to be afraid of *Styx*, *Acheron*, and ſuch ridiculous Trifles? And *Plato* alone ſeems only to ſpeak doubtingly, when in his *Phædon*, ſpeaking of the Rewards of good Men, concludes with a τοῦτο μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἂν πάνυ διϊσχυρισαίμην. I cannot poſitively determine in this matter.

To theſe I muſt add many more Teſtimonies, together with that large Quotation of *Pliny*, with which our Author fills two whole Pages and more; but theſe may ſuffice to make it appear that we can have no certainty of a future State but from the Scriptures: And that Natural Religion, Mr. *Blount*'s *Diana*, can give no ſatisfaction in this Point controverted (as he ſays) by Men of the greateſt Learning and Parts.

It would be now worth knowing, what are the Expectations of a *Deiſt*, with relation to this future State? To which Mr. *Blount* replies,

(Pag.

(Pag. 91.) *That there is a probability of ſuch a* Deiſt's *ſalvation, before the Credulous and ill living* Papiſts: which in truth is no more then this, the *Deiſt* hath more probability of his ſalvation then he that hath none at all. Eſpecially if he be in earneſt when he writes,

(Pag. 92.) *That the Popiſh Religion ſtands on the ſame Foundation with Heathen Idolatry.* I ſay, if he be in earneſt; for in his Notes on *Philoſtratus*, (*p.* 84.) ſpeaking of *Cato*'s Sarcaſm (in *Tully*'s ſecond Book *De Divinatione*) with Reſpect to the Pagan Southſayers, and blaming his prophane Acquaintance, he ſeems to be of another mind. Very miſerable and ſad muſt the condition of Mankind be, if there be no certain Rules whereby Salvation may be obtained. Yet ſuch is the Condition into which *Deiſm* would bring us, although we live according to its Principles.

Pag. 118. Seneca *hath not wanted* Advocates *for the aſſertion of his Opinion; nay, even ſuch who would pretend to juſtifie it out of the very Scriptures themſelves: as when* Solomon *ſays* (*Eccl.* 12.) Then ſhall the Duſt return to Duſt as it was, and the Spirit to God that gave it—And *Eccleſ.* 3. 20, 21. All go to the ſame place, all are of Duſt, and all turn to Duſt again; who knoweth the Spirit of Man that goeth upward, and the Spirit of the Beaſt that goeth downward to the Earth. Again, *Eccleſ.* 3. 19. That which befalleth the Sons of Men, befalleth Beaſts, even one thing befalleth them both; as

the

the one dieth, ſo doth the other; yea, they have all one Breath, ſo that a Man hath no pre-eminence above a Beaſt.

ANSWER.

Our Author takes it for granted, that *Seneca* was of opinion that the Soul was mortal, the contrary hath been proved be to queſtionable. Theſe places of holy Scripture have been made uſe of by Mr. *Hobbs* in his *Leviathan*, p. 303. The great Art in managing this Argument, conſiſts in confounding the Senſe of thoſe ſeveral places of holy Scripture, which are to be interpreted a part from each other; as is obſerved in *Hobbs* his Creed, p. 223. the *Preacher* in this Book ſets forth the beginning, progreſs and ripeneſs of his Diſquiſition, concerning the Happineſs of man: Wherefore in the beginning of his Enquiry, he ſetteth down his raw Apprehenſions; and he relateth in the firſt and ſecond Chapters, how he once thought Folly equal with Wiſdom, and that there was nothing better than to eat, and drink; and what adventures and tryals he made towards the better underſtanding of what was good for the Sons of Men. In his third Chapter, he declareth how full of Myſtery he found the works of God (ver. 11.) and how little was manifeſt, eſpecially to ſenſual Men, of the future State: But in the 11 and 12 Chapters, wherein he declareth his advanced judgment, and calleth Men off from the World, to the thoughts

thoughts of the day of Account, and to the early Remembrance of their Creatour; to the Fear of God, and the Obſervance of his Commands: He layeth it down as a poſitive Doctrine (a Doctrine apt to promote ſuch Obſervance, Fear, and Remembrance) which at firſt was delivered by him as a Problem, or as the miſtake of worldly Men, that when the wheel ſhall be broken at the ciſtern, and the circle of our Blood utterly diſturbed; then the Duſt ſhall return to the Earth as it was, and the Spirit ſhall return to God who gave it.

This is a full and ſatisfactory Anſwer to the Advocates of this Opinion; yet we might ſay wih good Reaſon and good Authority, That *Solomon* in the forecited places, perſonates the *Atheiſt*, *Raimundus Pug. Fid. p.* 155.

What our Author affirms (p. 119) concerning ſome Men, who have miſapply'd thoſe forecited places of holy Writ, to the *Anima Mundi* of *Pythagoras*; and which hath been revived by *Averroes*, and *Avicenna*: And to what end (p. 125.) he refers his Lordſhip the Right Honourable *Strephon* to *Pomponatius*, and eſpecially to *Cardan*, is here to be conſidered; becauſe we may ſee from hence, in what Authors our *Deiſts* are converſant, and how dangerous thoſe Authors are.

Averroes (as *Ricker* aſſerts, lib. 4. Hiſt. Gen. Concil. par. ult. p. 22.) was condemned in the *Lateran* Council, under *Leo* the X. becauſe he held, That there was one only Soul in all Men; which

which is the Universal Soul, the *Anima Mundi*? Whereas 'tis certain that every Man hath a particular Soul of his own. So that this Doctrine of *Averroes* tends to the subversion of all Religion and Piety: a Doctrine fit for the Devil. For as *Cardan* (in his 19. Book *de Subtil.*) tells us, the tallest of the *Dæmons* that talked with his Father, *Palam Averroistam se profitebatur*, told him plainly, *That he was an* Averroist.

Pomponatius (as Dr. *More lib.* 3. *de Immortal. anim. c.* 16. informs us) was of opinion, that there were not as many particular Souls, as Men. He acknowledged the Wisdom and Miracles of *Christ*, but referr'd all to the Stars. This was the *Petrus Pomponatius*, who was (as *Richer* says in the forecited place) Preceptor to Pope *Leo* the X. and by whose command he writ the Book *De Immortalitate Animæ:* which was then generally read, as Books of that nature commonly are; but thanks be to God, such Books are forbidden amongst us by Proclamation.

Cardan (to whom he especially refers the most Ingenious *Strephon*, p. 117.) affirms the Law of *Christ* to be from *Jupiter* and *Mercury:* that *Jupiter* being in the Ascendant was the cause of his so soon disputing with the Doctors in the Temple: that it was *Saturn* rendred him sad; whence *Josephus* took occasion to say, —*Visus est sæpius flere, ridere nunquam.* That *Jupiter* meeting with *Venus*, was the cause of our *Lord*'s having red Specks in his Face; for which he

cites, *Joſephus*, ſaying, He was *Lentiginoſus in facie.*

Out of what hath been ſaid, it clearly appears That Impious and Blaſphemous Authors are in repute with our *Deiſts*, and that conſequently 'tis no wonder, that ſuch *Oracles* (as theſe Pretended *Oracles of Reaſons)* are obtruded to the World.

Laſtly, it muſt not paſs unobſerved, That this *Cardan*, who has ſo wickedly derogated from our *Lord*, hath alſo falſly fathered on *Joſephus* the two forecited Aſſertions; neither is there the leaſt footſteps of either of them in any of the Works of *Joſephus.*

Pag. 124. *Beſides the authority of the holy Scriptures, as alſo the innumerable other arguments, which may be deduced as well from* Philoſophy *as* Reaſon, *to prove the Immortality of the Soul, together with its Rewards and Puniſhments (tho' I determine not their Duration) yet there is no argument of greater weight with me, than the abſolute neceſſity and convenience that it ſhould be ſo; as well to compleat the Juſtice of* God, *as to perfect the Happineſs of Man, not only in this World, but in that which is to come.*

ANSWER.

That the Arguments which are brought from the Holy Scriptures, are only ſufficient to prove the Immortality of the Soul; and the Rewards and Puniſhments of a Future State, hath been proved

proved already: and it will appear to be ſo, by what remains to be ſaid, with reſpect hereunto. Yet our Author, altho' he appeals to their Authority, can have no benefit thereof: Foraſmuch as he makes our Saviour and *Moſes Politicians*, p. 121. *And perhaps theſe Lawgivers eſtabliſhed the Immortality of the Soul, not ſo much out of regard to Truth, as to Honeſty, hoping thereby to induce Men to Virtue*, p. 123.

His perhaps cannot excuſe him from Blaſphemy, and a deſign of Subverting the *Holy Oracles*. For how little regard he hath for them, appears from his Parentheſis concerning the Duration of Future Rewards and Puniſhments, the Scriptures being poſitive, as well in the one, as in the other; and the Duration of them is of abſolute neceſſity to compleat the Juſtice of God, as to perfect the Happineſs of Man, not only in this World, but in that which is to come, if the Scriptures be true.

What he ſays of the Arguments which may be deduced from *Philoſophy* and *Reaſon*, we will now examine; and produce the ſtrongeſt, and moſt inſiſted on. This Argument is laid down by *Plato* in his *Phædrus*, made uſe of by *Tully* in his *Tuſculan* Queſtions, Book the firſt, and in his ſixth Book of a *Common-wealth*.

Plato is always preferr'd by *Tully* before *Ariſtotle*, and is called by him *The God of Philoſophers*. And now let us ſee how he proves the Soul's Immortality, on which depend Future

Rewards and Punishments: πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἀθάνατος· τὸ γὰρ ἀεικίνητον ἀθάνατον τὸ δὲ ἄλλο κινῶν καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλου κινούμενον, παύλαν ἔχον κινήσεως παύλαν ἔχει ζωῆς. μόνον δὲι τὸ αὐτὸ κινοῦν, ἅτε οὐκ ἀπολείπον ἑαυτὸ, ὅποτε λήγει κινούμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσα κινεῖται τοῦτο πηγὴ κινήσεως. ἀρχὴ δὲ ἀγένητον. ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ἀναγκη πᾶν τὸ γιγνόμενον γιγνεσθαι, αὐτὴν δὲ μηδ' ἐξ ἑνός. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἀρχὴ γίγνοιτο, ὐκ ἂν ἐξ ἀρχης γίγνοιτο ἔτι δὲ ἀγένητον ἐστι καὶ ἀνάφθορον αὐτὸ ἀνάγκη εἶναι. That is that mighty Argument which *Plato* calls a Demonstration; and concludes this is sufficient for the demonstration thereof.

The *Analysis* of which is; The Soul is always in Motion; that which is always in Motion, is Self-moving; that which is Self-moving, is never deserted of it self; that which never deserts it self, never ceases to move; that which never ceases to move, is the Source and Origin of all Motion; that which is the Source of all Motion, hath no Beginning; and that which hath no Beginning, hath no Ending.

Whereas every Proposition is either false or uncertain, or incoherent, as Mr. *Parker* in his Censure of the Platonick Philosophy hath observed.

Many such like trifling Argumentations are remarked by *Baptista Crispus*. And *Theopompus* truly maintains that many of *Plato*'s Dialogues are trifling and false, as many of them are stolen out

out of the Diſcourſes of *Ariſtippus*, or *Antiſthenes*, or *Bryſon* of *Heraclea*.

Can any Man in his right Wits imagine that the immortality of the Soul can be proved from hence? Can any Man think that *Plato* himſelf thought this to be a good Proof? Certainly I think notwithſtanding his Boaſts of a Demonſtration, he could not be ſo vain, nor ſo illogical, as to think ſo.

Maximus Tyrius, in his 28th Diſſertation, tells us, that *Pythagoras* was the firſt Philoſopher among the Greeks, who did dare (τόλμησε is his Word) to own the Immortality of the Soul. Whereas if this had been a Matter of abſolute Neceſſity antecedent to Revelation, there had been no ſuch Preſumption in *Pythagoras*. So that this Argument (of great Weight, as he calls it) is of no Weight at all. It may perhaps become the Harangues of the Parſons (as our Author ſcornfully writes, *p.* 118.) in a Country Auditory, but is very unbecoming ſuch a Damaſippus and great Bearded Philoſopher, as our Author is accounted by his Admirers.

Pythagoras alſo (according to the foreſaid Author) is ſaid to be the firſt who aſſerted the Pre-exiſtence of Souls; which was a very general Opinion amongſt the Ancients. Of this Opinion were the Gymnoſophiſts, and other wiſe Men of *Egypt*, the Brachmans of *India*, the Magi of *Babylon* and *Perſia*, as appears plainly by the Magical Oracles of *Zoroaſter*

with the Scholies of *Pletho*, and the Chaldaic Oracle with the Scholies of *Pſellus*: Nay, *Ariſtotle* himſelf was of this Opinion, as is to be ſeen in his ſecond Book, *De Generat. Animal. c.* 3. where his Opinion of the Immortality of the Soul and Pre-exiſtence are ſo connected, as if the one did ſuppoſe the other. Now the Arguments made uſe of were excluſively drawn from the Soul's Operations incommunicable to the Body; which is the beſt Argument Natural Reaſon can ſuggeſt. The Method of our Author is wholly new, and the Weakneſs of it rather Subverts then Eſtabliſheth what it pretends.

Wherefore I ſhall conclude this Subject in the Words of the moſt learned Biſhop of *Worceſter*, in the third Book of his *Origines Sacræ*, *p.* 608, and 609.

'The Scriptures give the moſt faithful Re-
'preſentation of the State and Condition of
'the Soul of Man. The World was almoſt
'loſt in Diſputes concerning the Nature, Con-
'dition, and Immortality of the Soul, before
'Divine Revelation was made known to Man-
'kind by the Goſpel of Chriſt; but Life and
'Immortality was brought to Light by the
'Goſpel, and the future State of the
'Soul of Man not diſcovered in an uncertain
'Platonical way, but with the greateſt Light
'and Evidence from that God who hath the
'Supream Diſpoſal of Souls, and therefore
'beſt knows and underſtands them. The

'Scri-

'Scriptures plainly and fully reveal a Judge-
'ment to come, in which God will judge the
'Secrets of all Hearts; when every one muſt
'give an accouut of himſelf to God; and God
'will call Men to give an account of their
'Stewardſhip here of all the Receipts they
'have from him, and the Expences they have
'been at, and the Improvements they have
'made of the Talents he put into their Hands.
'So that the Goſpel of Chriſt is the fulleſt In-
'ſtrument of the Diſcovery of the certainty
'of the future State of the Soul, and the con-
'ditions which abide it, upon its being diſ-
'lodged from the Body.

This Paſſage of that excellent Prelat is a full confirmation of what I have written of this Subject, and a brief Refutation of this Oracle of Reaſon.

Pag. 126. *It makes me admire at what you ſay, that a Perſon of ſuch Honour, Knowledge, and Judgment, as Sir* Henry Savil *was, ſhould ſo far complement the Jewiſh, as to rob the Engliſh World of the fifth Book of* Tacitus's *Hiſtory, by omitting any part of it in his Verſion; ſince, according to the true Method of Tranſlating, an Author ought not to be drawn off, but generouſly and freely poured out of one Language into another; leaſt in ſeparating him from the Dregs, you leave the Spirit behind you.*

ANSWER.

I do not remember Sir *Henry Savil* gives any Reaſon (why he omitted the Tranſlation of the fifth Book of *Tacitus*'s Hiſtory) either in his Epiſtle to the Reader, or in his Notes, or in any other of his Learned Works. But I ſuppoſe the true Reaſon was becauſe *Tacitus*'s account of the Jews is full of Slanders, Falſhoods, and Contradictions. Wherefore *Tertullian* calls *Tacitus* (tho' in other things an excellent Hiſtorian) *mendaciorum pleniſſimus ſcriptor*; a Writer who abounded with Lies.

Tacitus in many places of his Account is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, ſo that our Author may ceaſe his Admiration, if he be in earneſt in the 134th Page of his Book, where he thus writes; *The Relations of* Trogus Tacitus, *and the reſt, are only the uncertain Accounts of partial Authors, ſince the beſt and only Hiſtory extant to be relied on for this Subject is the Holy Scriptures, dictated as every good Chriſtian ought to believe by the Holy Spirit.*

Whoſomever conſiders that *Deiſm* is repugnant to Chriſtianity (as I have proved) may juſtly admire at theſe laſt Expreſſions.

For my part, I cannot liken Mr. *Blount* to any Man but to him in *Lucian*, who was half White and half Black; or to him in the Comedy,

medy, that out of the ſame Mouth blowed both Hot and Cold.

But he may in ſome faſhion be excuſed, for he hath really obſerved *Pliny*'s Rule, relating to the Title of his Book. That of *Cardan* in the 19th Book, *De Subtilitate*, is here verified (and he ſays, demonſtrated in his Book, *De Fato*) *Si Oracula ambigua non eſſent, non eſſent Oracula.* If theſe Oracles are not Ambiguous and Contradictory, they would not be Mr. *Blounts*'s Oracles.

And here I cannot but admire that Mr. *Blount* ſhould be guilty of the ſame fault, of which he accuſes Sir *Henry Savil*, for he Tranſlates not much above two Thirds of *Tacitus*'s account of the Jews. Shall we ſay he did this to complement the Jewiſh, and to rob the Engliſh Nation of the Spirit behind? Was he not obliged to do it for his deſervedly Honoured, and moſt Ingenious Major *A.* as he calls him, *p.* 126? Or ſhall we ſay that he only ſeparated the Dregs for his ingenious Major *A?* I am ſure he hath been very diſingenious in his Tranſlation, for he hath not only abuſed his Major, but his Reader alſo; nay, *Tacitus* himſelf.

Tacitus ſays that the Jews did, *Effigiem animalis, quo monſtratore errorem ſitimque depulerant, penetrali ſacravere.*

Which place he thus Tranſlates, *They likewiſe Conſecrated the Effigies of an Aſs, for being*

their

their Guide to the Waters where they ſatisfied their Thirſt. Whereas *Tacitus* makes no mention of an Aſs, unleſs *Animal* be Latin for an Aſs.

And whereas *Tacitus* ſays they conſecrated an Animal *in penetrali*, that is, their Holy of Holies— he omitted that Word. The Lye was ſo great that the ingenious Major could not ſwallow it.

For my part I cannot conjecture why he ſhould only tranſlate two Thirds, and omit the other, but that he conceived the Part untranſlated would have ſpoiled his Project. For there is a palpable Contradiction in *Tacitus*, which renders his Account Fabulous. In the Part untranſlated, *Tacitus* ſays, *Ægyptii Effigies venerantur, Judæi ſola mente.* The Egyptians worſhip Images, the Jews abhor them. *Tacitus* alſo adds, *Judæi nulla ſimulachra habent in urbibus nedum in Templis.* The Jews have no Graven Images nor Idols to be ſeen in their Cities, much leſs in their Temples. The contrary whereof we find in the Tranſlation of Mr. *Blount*, as alſo in *Tacitus*.

Pag. 132. Abraham *and* Moſes *ſeemed firſt to inſtitute Religious Worſhip, and both of them were well skilled in Egyptian Learning; which gave occaſion for ſome to think, that* Moſes *and the Jews took divers of their Cuſtoms from the Egyptians: as for inſtance their Circumciſion, becauſe* Herodotus *ſays*, That the Phænicians and Syrians in *Paleſtine* (which muſt be the

Jews,

Jews, ſince none elſe uſed it in *Paleſtine*) took their Circumciſion from the Egyptians; as alſo (*ſays he*) they confeſs the ſame themſelves; nor does *Joſephus* deny as much.

ANSWER.

We know nothing for certain concerning the Inſtitution of Divine Worſhip but from *Moſes*. And from him, (*Gen.* 4. ver. 26.) we learn, *That Men began to call upon the Name of the Lord in the Days of* Enos. That is, The number of Families increaſing in the Days of *Enos*, they appointed more Publick Places for God's Service, in which at ſet Times they might together, and in a more ſolemn Congregation, worſhip their great Creator. This is the Senſe of the Chaldee Interpreter, and approved by our preſent moſt Reverend Arch-Biſhop in his Diſcourſe of Idolatry, *p.* 40.

Joſephus in the firſt Book of his Antiquities, Chap. 4. ſays, 'That for ſeven Gene-'rations Men perſevered in Worſhipping the 'true God, and had a regard to Vertue; but 'in proceſs of Time Men degenerated and for-'ſook πατρῶους ἐθισμούς, the Inſtitutions of their 'Anceſtors. If this ſeems otherwiſe to Mr. *Blount*, it is not to be wondered at, ſince, *p.* 17. he poſitively affirms, *That it is evident that the five Books of* Moſes *were written by another Hand after his deceaſe.*

That

That *Moses* was instituted in the Egyptian Learning we readily grant; he was accounted by some of the Gentiles an Egyptian Priest; but the same cannot be affirmed of *Abraham*. *Josephus* is very plain, when in the first Book of his Antiquities, Chap. 9. he asserts, *That the Egyptians learned all the Knowledge they had in* Arithmetick *and* Astronomy *from* Abraham.

Τὴν τὸ ἀριθμετικὴν ἀτοῖς χαρίζεται, καὶ τὰ περὶ αςρονομίαν παραδίδωσι, πρὸ γὰς τὴς Αβράμου παρουσίας εἰς Αἰγύπτον οἱ Αἰγύπτεοι τουτῶν εἶχον ἀμαθῶς. When *Abraham* came into *Egypt* he taught the Egyptians *Astronomy* and *Arithmetick*, of which they were ignorant before. So that the Knowledge of these Sciences came first from the Chaldeans to the Egyptians, and from them to the Greeks.

Whether *Moses* and the Jews took Circumcision from the Egyptians, hath been a Subject of great Dispute. The well known place in *Herodotus* seems to me to say so much, although our late great Critick, *Bisnagius*, in his *Exerc. Hist. Critic.* (*p.* 119.) will by no means grant it. *Grotius* in his Annotations on the 1st Book of the Truth of Christ. Religion, cites *Herodotus* at large, and chargeth *Herodotus* with reporting an Untruth. He doth not deny but that *Herodotus* says, that the Jews confess, that they learned the Rite of Circumcision from the Jews; but he says *Herodotus* did them an Injury in saying so. *Tantum vero abest*

(says

(ſays *Grotius*) *ut Judæi faſſi ſunt unquam ab Ægyptiis ſe accepiſſe hunc ritum, ut contra aperte dicunt Ægyptios ab Joſepho didiciſſe circumcidi*; 'Tis ſo far from Truth, that the Jews ſhould confeſs that they received this Rite from the Egyptians; that on the contrary they boldly affirm that the Egyptians learned Circumciſion from *Joſeph*. And for this *Grotius* in the place cited refers to Authorities.

What Mr. *Blount* writes concerning *Joſephus*, the Hiſtorian, is of no moment. *Joſephus* in the 8th. Book of his Antiquities, ch. 4. cites this place of *Herodotus*. He cites the ſame place alſo in his firſt Book againſt *Apian*. Neither doth he deny in thoſe places what *Herodotus* affirms, but is altogether ſilent: of which Silence, *Biſnagius Exerc. Hiſt. Crit. p.* 120. gives a good Account: 'Becauſe (ſaith he) *Joſephus* 'had long before expreſs'd his Opinion of the 'Original of *Circumciſion*, *lib.* 1. *Antiq. c.* 11. θεὸς προσέταξε δὲ τὸ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γένος βουλόμενος μείνειν τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ συμφερόμενον περιτέμνεσθαι τὰ ἀφιδοῖα.

God commanded that the Poſterity of *Abraham* ſhould be circumciſed, that they might keep themſelves a part, and ſeparate from all others. And *Joſephus* to the ſame purpoſe, *lib.* 1. *c.* 22. ὁκάξ' ἐκείνου ἔθος ἔχουσι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πιοεῖσθαι τὰς περίτομας, '*Abraham* being an hun-'dred years old, when *Iſaac* was born, who 'was circumciſed the eighth day: And the ſame cuſtom is continued for the *Circumciſion* of Chil-

Children, after the ſame number of days.

From which it neceſſarily follows, That *Joſephus* his Opinion of *Circumciſion*, was very different from that of *Herodotus*: He ſays the *Jews* had it from the *Egyptians*; *Joſephus* ſays, they had it from *God*, and that they might be diſtinguiſh'd from other Nations; and conſequently *Circumciſion* was among the *Jews* long before the *Egyptians* had it. So that Mr. *Blount* may juſtly be accuſed of *Incogitancy*, and of not Reading the Authors he cites.

Of this Opinion, or not much differing from it, was *Photius*, that Learned Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, in his 205th. Ep. to *Theod. Hegumenos.* εἰ δὲ τῶν χαλδαίων λοιπὸν, &c. 'The *Circumciſion* 'of *Abraham* and his Poſterity, was inſtituted 'as an Emblem of Reſtraint from Inceſtuous 'Copulations: The *Chaldeans* did lie with their Mothers, Daughters, and Siſters, by a wicked and abominable Cuſtom. Wherefore that neither *Abraham*, nor his Poſterity ſhould be polluted with theſe their wicked Practices, *God* inſtituted *Circumciſion*. The circumciſing his own Fleſh, importing the dividing and averting him from thoſe of his Conſanguinity, or Affinity, in reſpect of Conjugal Converſation. Whereas the *Chaldeans* Impurity and Inceſt, continued a long while after *Abraham*'s time, without either Fear or Shame.

And here it muſt not paſs unobſerv'd, That Mr. *Blount* makes uſe of the ſame Method, that the profeſt Enemies of *Chriſtianity* did of old.

Julian

Julian the Apoſtate affirmed that the Jews learned to Circumciſe from the Egyptians; as we are told by St. *Cyril*, Book the Tenth, *contra Julianum*, *p.* 354. And *Celſus* affirms the ſame thing; to whom *Origen*, *Lib.*2. *p.*17. returns this Anſwer, πρῶτον ἐν ἀνθρώποις περιτετμῆσθαι τὸν Ἀβραάμ. That *Abraham* was the firſt of all Mankind that was Circumciſed.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

Of Marrying two Siſters, Judaiſm, Chriſtianity, Millenaries.

PAg. 136. *It is lawful to marry two Siſters: The firſt Text of Scripture which is commonly urged in this caſe, is that of marrying a Brother's Wife, which ſeems to be forbidden; where by a ſide wind, they would bring in that of marrying a wife's Siſter, as parallel, ſaying*, Ubi eadem ratio, ibi idem Jus; *but with their Pardon, the Simile doth not run upon four feet; the reaſon is not the ſame, for the words (in* Leviticus 18. *and* 16.) *which forbid the marrying a Brother's Wife, ſay*, Becauſe a Man thereby uncovers his Brother's nakedneſs; *which ſeems not at all to be a good reaſon againſt marrying the Wife's Siſter; becauſe every Man is ſuppoſed to have diſcovered his firſt Wife's nakedneſs before any ſuch Marriage with her Siſter.*

ANSWER.

Our Author's Opinion concerning Marrying two Siſters, ſeems to me grounded on that which He *calls* (in the 100 p. of his Book) *the bewitching ſmiles of a Woman*; whom he there un-

unhandſomly denominates, *The moſt lovely Brute of the Univerſe.* And I doubt not but his Friend *Toriſmond* (as he calls him p. 135.) looks on it as his beſt Argument.

We do not ſay that Similies always run on four feet, but I am ſure the preſent Similies do. The reaſon of the Law is the ſame, both as to Brothers and Siſters: And whereas he ſays, *Every Man is ſuppoſed to have diſcovered his firſt Wife's nakedneſs*; He ſeemeth not to underſtand the Scripture Phraſe, which is only uſed with relation to a turpitude committed by an unlawful Marriage. If a Woman marries her Father, ſhe diſcovers the nakedneſs of her Mother in a Scriptural ſenſe; tho' in our Author's Unſcriptural ſenſe, Her Mother's nakedneſs was diſcovered before by Her Father.

Mr. *Selden* in his *Uxor Hebraica*, Book firſt Chap. 6. tells us (that whereas we read in the 16th. Verſe of the 18th. Chapter, *It is thy Brother's nakedneſs*) in a moſt ancient Copy of the *Greek* Verſion, in the *King*'s Library at Saint *James*'s: Inſtead of *Turpitudo eſt fratri tui*, the words are γυνὴ δὲ ἀδελφοῦ σού ἐστιν, *She is thy Brother's Wife: Quaſi* (ſays *Selden*) *ipſo nomine ſeu turpitudinis, ſeu nuditatis fratris fœmina, ſeu uxor ejus expreſſim nominaretur*: 'As if (ſays he) he by 'the words *turpitude*, or *nakedneſs*, of this Bro'ther, his Woman, or his Wife, was expreſly 'named. If this Remark of Mr. *Selden*'s be well, it is of good uſe: So that the Reaſon of the

Law is the ſame in marrying of two Siſters, as marrying a Brother's Wife.

The Senſe of the Law with Relation to Brothers, is, *Thou ſhalt not uncover the nakedneſs of thy Brother's Wife, for it is thy Brother's nakedneſs.* And by a parity of reaſon, *Thou ſhalt not uncover the nakedneſs of thy wife's Siſter, ; for it is thy Wife's nakedneſs.* What our Author ſays concerning Penal Laws, that they are ty'd up to the very Letter, is true ; but it hath no place, *ubi eadem oratio*, Where there is the ſame reaſon. And therefore the *Karans*, or *Scripturians* among the *Jews* (who are oppoſed to the *Talmudiſts* or *Traditionals*) that bind themſelves moſt to the Scripture Rule, have reſolved this matter: Firſt, that there is place for Argument and Deduction, from the words of the Law: Secondly, that whatſoever can be deduced thence, either *a fortiori*, or *a pari*; either becauſe the remoter degree is prohibited, or that which is equally remote, is to be deemed piouſly and rightfully concluded.

Thus when ver. 7. the Father and Mother are both named ; and v. 12. *The Father's Siſter :* And v. 13. *The Mother's Siſter :* And v. 14. *The Father's Brother :* yet the Mother's Brother is not named ; nor the Siſter's Daughter, which would be equivalent with that. And yet this being the Marriage of the Uncle on the Mother's ſide with the Neece, which is of the ſame diſtance with the Uncle of the Father's ſide, with the Neece, and the Aunt on the Mother's ſide, with the

the Nephew, from the naming and prohibition of theſe, ver. 13 and 14. by the parity of reaſon, that which is not named, is by all reſolved to be prohibited.

And as Dr. *Hammond* p. 436. hath obſerv'd, juſt thus it is in this matter. The Wife's Siſter, which is not named, is directly in the ſame degree of Propinquity, with the Brother's Wife, which is named and prohibited.

Pag. 138. *The Canon of Scripture, which ſeems more nearly to concern this caſe, is* Leviticus 18. *ver.* 18. *where it is ſaid,* Neither ſhalt thou take a wife to her ſiſter to vex her, to uncover her nakedneſs, beſides the other in her life time: *But this doth not therefore ſeem to reſtrain or prohibit the marrying of two ſiſters one after the other; for the firſt being dead, the other cannot be a Rival or vexation* (*as the Text calls it*) *to her dead ſiſter: And then how ſhall the Prohibition be urg'd, if the reaſon of it be removed? it is rationally apparent that there is great ſtreſs placed in thoſe Expreſſions* (during her life) *and* (to vex her, in uncovering her ſhame upon her) *as doth more fully appear in our Tranſlation of the Bible in Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign, printed* An. Dom. 1599.

ANSWER.

If, as Mr. *Blount* ſays p. 137. all Penal Laws are ſtraitly ty'd up to the expreſs Letter of the Law (where there is *par ratio*, the like or ſame reaſon) and no where to be conſtrued by Pa-

rallels; he hath loſt more for his purpoſe in this place of holy Scripture, than he got by the former. For then nothing can be concluded from this place of *Leviticus*, for marrying a Wife's Siſter after her death, the expreſs Letter of the Law mentions nothing of it. All that can be ſaid for it from this place, is by deduction and conſequence.

I ſhall therefore give a full Solution in the words of the foreſaid Learned Doctor: p. 437. if by the *Engliſh* reading of our Bibles, *Leviticus* 18. ver. 18. (*Neither ſhalt thou take a wife to her ſiſter to vex her, to uncover her nakedneſs, beſide the other in her life-time*) it be thought that the marrying the Wife's Siſter in her life-time, be the only thing forbidden, that will preſently be anſwered from the margent of our Tranſlation, where the *Hebrew* word is fitly and truly rendred [*Not a wife to her ſiſter*] but [*one wife to another*] and ſo is a direct Prohibition of *Polygamy*; at leaſt, when the firſt is deprived and vexed, by taking in of the ſecond, but not a Permiſſion to marry, that was otherwiſe prohibited.

Pag. 140. *By the Apoſtolical Canons, a Perſon marrying two Siſters, was not to be a Prieſt; but that was the only puniſhment laid upon him: but doth not prejudice a lay-man, ſuch as my Friend* Toriſmond, *who I preſume never deſigns to enter into the Prieſtly Office, unleſs it were to be a Confeſſor to the Fair Sex.*

A N-

ANSWER.

I am glad to hear Mr. *Blount*'s Friend *Toriſmond* doth not deſign to enter into holy Orders: God forbid that ſuch principled Men ſhould have any benefit of the Clergy.

The miſtake of *Grotius* (mention'd p. 139.) proceeds from his not conſulting the *Hebrew*, as appears from what hath been written before, from the Margent of our Tranſlation.

The Apoſtolical Canon, ſo much uſed in this Controverſy, is the 19. ὁ δὺο ἀδελφὰς, ἀγαζόμενος ἢ ἀδελφιδῆν, ὃ δύναται εἶναι κλήρικος. *He who hath married two Siſters, or the Brother's Daughter, ought not to be admitted into holy Orders.*

Now as *Grotius*, and after him our Author, were miſtaken, by following the vulgar *Greek* Tranſlation, ſo they are both here miſtaken in their Inference from this Canon. And foraſmuch as Doctor *Hammond*'s Anſwer to this Difficulty, is moſt excellent; I will ſet it down in his own words: 'Where if it be thought, 'that this is no mark of the unlawfulneſs of the 'thing, but only an Interdict to the Clergy, that 'they ſhall not marry thus, leaving it free to 'others: this will be the ſame ſtrange way of 'arguing, as if from the Qualifications of the 'Biſhop, ſet down by St. *Paul*, that he ſhould 'be no drunkard, no covetous perſon, *&c.* i. e. 'that ſuch as are ſo, ſhould not be admitted to

'holy Orders, we ſhould conclude that theſe
'Qualities might be free and lawful for other
'Men, who were not Eccleſiaſticks ; or becauſe
'the Biſhop muſt be one that hath not married
'afrer ſuch divorces, as are forbidden by *Chriſt*;
'and the Widow is to be the Wife but of one
'Husband in like manner, it weretherefore law-
'ful for all other Chriſtians to uſe ſuch di-
'vorces, and marry again, which we know was
'prohibited by *Chriſt*; or that other Chriſtian
'Women might have more Husbands, or leave
'one, and marry another; which we know was
'never lawful among any Civil, tho' Heathen
'People. The plain of it is, that the only thing
'concluſible from the Interdicts of the Church
'Canons, is the frequency of ſuch practices a-
'mong Unbelievers, which made it neceſſary to
'revive and refreſh the Prohibition to Chri-
'ſtians: To whom, under *Chriſt*, ſuch Marri-
'ages were reputed ſo foul, and the ſtate of
'ſuch ſins being permanent, did ſo muchen hance
'them above the nature of ſingleactsof greater
'ſins; that, altho' for every commiſton of any
'known ſin, a Man were not made uncapable of
'any Dignity in the Church (or rendred irre-
'gular, if after the receiving Orders, he were
'found guilty) yet of theſe ſins he that were
'once guilty, ſhould for ever remain under a
'brand, and be counted uncapable of Holy
'Orders, which he that were otherwiſe worthy,
'would not ſurely have been, had it not been
'accounted unlawful, before that Canon in-

'flicted

'flicted that punishment on the offender. And 'then it being acknowledged that *Christ* hath 'not descended to the specifying of such parti-'culars; and that the Apostle that speaketh of 'one such sin, saith it was not named among 'the *Gentiles*; the result will be, that this brand 'of the Apostolical Canon, is founded in the 'Universal Prohibition, obliging all Men, and 'so the *Christians* of all Nations, as well as the '*Jews*; and that not abrogated, but confirm'd, 'and by stricter Precepts of Continence, and De-'nunciations against the Incontinent, continued 'on the *Christian* by *Christ*

I know nothing in this account of this Great Man, but will pass muster, save only that passage; in which he affirms, That it was never lawful among any Civil, tho' Heathen People, that a Woman might leave one Husband, and marry another.

For I am perswaded there was such a Law among the *Athenians*. *Plutarch* in the Life of *Alcibiades* says, That *His Wise* Hipparete, *being a very chaste woman, and being provoked by his Adulteries, would have divorced him; and that the Law was, that she should depose* ἀπολειψεως γράμματα παρὰ τῷ Αρχοντι κάτα τὸν νόμον, *that she should depose the Bill of Divorce with the* Archon, *according to Law.* But *Alcibiades* by slight of hand prevented it, by tearing the Bill in pieces. However this shews what the Law was among the *Athenians*.

Whether there was such a Law among the *Romans*, I do not remember; but their practice is manifest.

Sic fiunt octo Mariti
——quinque per Autumno. Juven. Sat. 6.

It was grown a Custom among the Women to have eight Husbands in five Years.

Et nubet decimo jam Telesina *viro.*
Martial lib. 6.

Telesina is resolved to marry the tenth Husband.

And *Seneca lib.* 3. *de Benefic. cap.* 16. *Non consulum, sed maritorum numero annos computant*; 'The Women now a-days do not compute 'their Years by the Consuls, but by their Hus-'bands.

Joseph Scaliger in his Animadversions on *Eusebius*, gives us this short, but pertinent Account, *Apud* Romanos & Græcos, *tam mulier quam vir, potest alter alteri dicere, ut res suas sibi habeat, quin nomina rei illius propria jure* Attico *prodita erant, ut si vir discederet ab uxore hoc diceretur* ἀποπέμπω, *si mulier diceretur* ἀπόλειψις. That is,

It was a Practice both among the Romans and Greeks, for Women as well as Men, to Divorce each other. And there are proper Words in the Laws of the Athenians, whereby both these Divorces are expressed. If the Divorce be on the Man's side, it is called a

Di-

Diſmiſſion, if on the Woman's ſide a Dereliction.

Had Friend *Toriſmond* been Confeſſor to the fair Sex (*p.* 140.) in thoſe Days, he would have been much peſtered with thoſe lovely Brutes, (*p.* 160.)

But I muſt beg Pardon for dealing thus rudely with the Aſhes of one of the learnedſt Men of his time; and if I ſhould ſay one of the exacteſt Criticks in *Europe*, I ſhould ſay but a preciſe Truth. And perhaps (as I truly believe) it was but a ſlip of the Pen. But I ſhall now take my Leave of him, and meet Mr. *Blount* and *Grotius*, who hath afforded him ſo much Aſſiſtance in this Point. It is to be lamented that ſuch a Perſon ſhould give any Countenance to ſo great an Error.

Pag. 142. *Canon Elibertinus* 61. *Si Quis poſt obitum uxoris ſuæ, ſororem ejus duxerit & ipſa fuerit fidelis, per quinquennium eum a communione abſtinere; eo ipſo oſtendens, manere vinculum Matrimonii; & ut jam diximus in Canonibus qui Apoſtolici dicuntur, qui duas ſorores duxerit aut fratris filiam tantum Clericus fieri prohibetur.* This Mr. *Blount* hath out of *Grotius, lib.* 2. *cap.* 5. *de Iure pacis & Belli*, and he thus Tranſlates it; 'If any one after the 'Death of his Wife, Marries her Siſter, and 'ſhe proves faithful to him, he muſt, during 'five Years, abſtain from the Communion; 'which plainly ſhews that the Bond of Matri-'mony ſtill remains inviolable: *And as we*

have

have already ſaid, in thoſe Canons which are called Apoſtolical, whoſoever Marries two Siſters or his Brothers Daughter, is only forbid to be a Prieſt.

ANSWER.

Mr. *Blount* in his Tranſlation, hath changed the *ipſa*, She, into *ipſi*, Him; the Nominative into the Dative. He hath changed the Senſe of *Fidelis*, which here ſignifieth a Chriſtian, and is oppoſed to *Gentilis*, a Gentile, into a Womans Chaſtneſs and Fidelity, to her Husband; which, as *Gabriel Albaſpine*, ſometimes Biſhop of *Orleance*,, in his Notes on this Council ſhews, alters the Caſe much.

I much admire how *Grotius* could gather out of this Council, that the Bond of ſuch a Matrimony ſhould remain inviolable, ſince the Canon makes no mention thereof, 'tis very illogical to conclude ſo peremptorily from the ſilence of tne Council, and from a Negative to infer ſuch an Affirmative, which we have reaſon to think repugnant to the Opinion of the Council. If a Man commits Inceſt by Marryng his Daughter, the higheſt Spiritual Puniſhment the Church can inflict is Excommunication; how unreaſonable would it be to conclude from hence, that the Church did adjudge the Bond of ſuch a Matrimony to be inviolable?

That

That Mr. *Blount* did err in this Concluſion, is a thing not much to be wondred at; *Grotius*'s Authority is a probable Apology for an Error. Would to God he had followed him in all things. But in this Mr. *Blount* is blameable, that he is not agreeable to himſelf. His Rule, (*p.* 137.) is, *That Penal Laws are ſtraitly to be tied to the expreſs Letter of the Law.* If this be true, he hath tranſgreſſed his own Rule in his Reduction and Inference from this Canon, which is purely Penal; the greateſt Puniſhment in the Old Canon Law is Excommunication, as *Duarenus* hath it in his Body of the Canon Law.

And the ſame is aſſerted by *Petrus de Marca*, in his Book, *de Concordia*, by *Widdrington*, in his Apology for Princes, by *Richerius*, in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Authority, and others who are reputed moſt Learned in the Roman Communion.

This Puniſhment is inflicted on Inceſt, Homicide, Adultery, and other grievous Crimes. St. *Auſtin* in his firſt Book, *Contra adverſ. Legis & Prophet.* ſays, that to be Excommunicated, is, *Gravius quam ferro puniri, quam flammis conſumi, quam feris ſubjici*; it is a greater Puniſhment than to be Beheaded, than to be conſumed by Fire, than to be thrown before Wild beaſts to be devoured. *Tertullian* in his *Apol. Sect.* 39. calls it, *Cenſura Divina*, God's Cenſure. *Summumque futuri judicii præjudicium eſt, ſi quis ita deliquerit, ut a commu-*

communicatione orationis, & Conventus, & omnis ſancti commercii relegetur. The Excommunicating of a Man, and ſeparating of him from the Benifit of the publick Prayers, and the holy Communion, and the holy Aſſemblies, is a repreſentation of the final judgment of Condemnation at the laſt Day. This is Religiouſly to be conſidered of by ſuch Perſons, who in our Days make a Mock at, and contemn Eccleſiaſtical Authority.

What concerns the Apoſtolical Canons in this Paragraph hath been before examined. He that impartially weighs the weakneſs of Mr. *Blount*'s Inference from the ſilence of the Canon in this place, and the weakneſs of his other Arguments, muſt think him over bold; when (*p.* 136.) he declares, *That in the Defence of Marrying two Siſters, he will enter the Liſts of Argument againſt any Levitical or Canonical Gameſter whatever.*

The Queries and other things which in this Controverſie are made uſe of by Mr. *Blount* in the following Pages, being only Corallaries and Concluſions of what hath been examined and refuted, we wholly pretermit as unneceſſary and inconſiderable.

I purpoſed here to have concluded this Subject, but conſidering two things relating thereunto, and that one ſerves for the better illuſtrating what hath been already written; and the other diſcovers the great Diſingenuity of Mr. *Blount*: I ſhall try my Readers Patience a lit-

little longer, whilſt I lay them down in order. The firſt is this,

There are ſeveral learned Men in the World who prefer the Greek Verſion of the 70, before the preſent Hebrew, which they account as a Copy, not an Original. And whereas the contrary Hypotheſis is the Ground of our Anſwer, to that place of the 18th of *Leviticus*, Ver. 8. which is the principal place in the whole Controverſie: I think it convenient to wave this Priviledge, and to joyn Iſſue upon the contrary Hypotheſis. I ſhall therefore lay down the Argument as it is in the Oracles, and ſubjoyn an Anſwer.

Pag. 139. *The Tranſlation of the Bible in Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign, Printed* Anno Dom. 1599. *reads that of* Leviticus *after this manner*— Thou ſhalt not take a Wife with her Siſter, during her Life to vex her, in uncovering her Shame upon her.

Which ſeems to be very ſuitable to the Greek Tranſlation, γυναῖκα ἐπ ἀδελφῇ ὃ λήψῃ ἀντίζηλον ἀποκαλύψαι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτῆς ἐπ' αὐτῆς, ἔτι ζώσης αὐτης, where the Prohibition running upon theſe Terms, or containing theſe Conditions, *That a Man ſhall not take a Wife* ἐπ' ἀδελφῇ αὐτῆ, *with her Siſter,* ἔτι ζώσης αὐτῆς, *during her Life, becauſe it would be* ἀντιζηλα, *a Vexation to her; but ſhe being dead, all theſe Inconveniencies expire with her, and ſo it may probably be imagined,* Ceſſante ratione ceſſat prohibitio.

AN-

ANSWER.

This Caſe of Marrying two Siſters was much agitated in the Primitive Times; the Apoſtolical Canons, and the Council of *Eliberis*, are ſufficient Proofs hereof. In the times of St. *Baſil* this Queſtion was Controverted; eſpecially between him and one *Diodorus*, or by one under his Name; (as appears out of St. *Baſil*, *Epiſt.* 197.) and as great brags were then made, as now by Mr. *Blount*. And this Oracle was then carried about as a Trophy, over that eminent Father.

The excellent Reply St. *Baſil* made, may make us ceaſe to wonder why *Grotius* did not cite it. To be ſure his Silence is a ſufficient Shield for Mr. *Blount*, we will therefore tranſlate what is there written, and paſs over the Original which is very long.

Becauſe (ſays he) the Writer of the Epiſtle by corrupt Argumentation hath endeavoured to induce Men into the Commiſſion of ſo grievous a Sin: It is a neceſſary Duty incumbent on us to prevent the ſame by true Ratiocination. The Epiſtle ſays 'tis written in *Leviticus*, *Thou ſhalt not Marry thy Wife's Siſter to vex her, whilſt ſhe is living*. From whence (ſaith the Epiſtle) 'tis manifeſt, you may Marry her Siſter when your Wife is dead.

We

We are asked, Whether it is not written, *That a Man may Marry his Wife's Sister?* We ſay it is a certain Truth, that no ſuch thing is written. No Perſon but the Legiſlator ought by virtue of any Conſequence to infer any thing from the ſilence of a Law. For if this Liberty be allowed, a Man may Marry his Wife's Siſter tho' his Wife be Living. For this, Sophiſm will ſerve that turn too; 'tis written, *Thou ſhalt not take thy Siſter, that ſhe may not vex thy Wife*; therefore where there is no Vexation in the caſe, the thing is lawful. They who are for this Opinion may ſoon pretend, that there will be no Vexation nor Jealoſies between the two Siſters. Wherefore the Cauſe being removed, for which the Legiſlator prohibited a Man to have two Siſters to Wife at one time, What ſhould hinder it? But you will ſay this is not written in the Law; neither (ſay I) is the other there written. But, I ſay, if Conſequences be allowed, the Conſequence is equal on either ſide, it grants equal Licenſe and Liberty.

How much this ſort of Marriage was abominated by the Ancient Chriſtians, St. *Baſil* abundantly declares, when in his Epiſtle he makes ἀκαθαρσία, Uncleanneſs to be the cauſe of it, and the Marriage it ſelf he calls ἀθεσμοσυνωρία, μήτε γάμος, an unlawful dwelling together, and no Marriage.

You may ſee how effectually *Baſil* hath refuted this pretended Oracle without Recourſe

to

to the Hebrew; for he makes uſe only of the Tranſlation of the 70. and Quotes the place of *Leviticus* in the ſame manner our *Deiſt* doth; the *Septuaginta* having ſuffered no Alteration in this place.

Pag. 144. *Whether the Solution of* Juſtinian *in the like caſes of Affinity, in the firſt* Book *of his Inſtitutions* (Tit. 10. de Nuptiis) *be not properly applicable to* Leviticus 18. *Ver.* 18. Si una tibi nupta eſt, ideo alteram uxorem ducere non poteris, quia duas ſorores eodem tempore habere non licet— *If you are Married to one, you cannot* Marry *the other, becauſe you cannot, that is, you ought not to be Married to two Siſters at one time.*

ANSWER.

I do not remember that I have met with a greater Diſingenuity in any Author, than I have here found in this place of Mr. *Blount*'s. I have conſulted *Juſtinian*'s Inſtitutes, with the Commentaries of *Antonius Contius*, *Jacobus Gothofredus*, and *Franciſcus Acourſius*, and I cannot find the place cited in any of theſe Editions. There is a place or two (*Tit. de Nuptiis*) concerning Marrying two Wifes, but not a Word of Marrying two Siſters So that I have reaſon to think, that Mr. *Blount* wilfully and fraudulently changed theſe Words, *duas uxores*, (twice uſed in that Title) into *duas ſorores*; two Wifes into two Siſters; although the

the preſent caſe is wholly omitted. And I am verily perſwaded that nothing can excuſe him, unleſs perhaps ſome inviſible Manuſcript, or ſome Edition never heard of before.

It is not to be paſſed over in ſilence, that our *Deiſt* in this Page propoſes a Query concerning the Canons of the Church of *England*, *viz. Whether if any of the Canons of the Church of* England *be dubious, it may not be proper and convenient to conſult the antient Canons for Explanation and Illuſtration?*

What he deſigns by this Query (his other Queries have either nothing to the purpoſe, or have been already anſwered) I cannot conjecture; conſidering his Conceſſions relating to the 99th Canon, and the Table of Marriage ſet forth by Authority, 1563. Wherefore to put all out of doubt, and to vindicate the Perſpicuity of the foremention'd Canon, and that the Illuſtration it receives from former Canons, makes more againſt Mr. *Blount* then otherwiſe: I will ſet down the Opinion of our Church concerning theſe Marriages, out of the Book Entituled —*Liber quorundam Canonum diſciplinæ Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ*, *Anno* 1581. in which Book we find theſe Words— *Omnia Matrimonia, quæ uſpiam contracta ſunt intra gradus cognationis aut affinitatis prohibitos in* 18 *Levitici, auctoritate Epiſcopi diſſolventur: maxime vero ſi quis priore uxore demortua, ejus ſororem uxorem duxerit: hic enim gradus communi Doctorum virorum conſenſu & judicio pu-nitur*

in Levitico prohiberi. That is, All Marriages which have been at any time contracted within the Degrees of Cognation or Affinity, prohibited in the 18th of *Leviticus*, ſhall by Epiſcopal Authority be diſſolved: Eſpecially if a Man marries his deceaſed Wife's Siſter. It is the Opinion of the Learned, that this Degree is prohibited in the forenamed Book of *Leviticus.* The Concluſion is very obvious, and our Anthor's wonted Subtilty hath proved a Diſadvantage to his Deſign.

Pag. 157. *I cannot find any Authentick Ground to believe, that the Sects among the Jews were more Antient then the Days of the* Maccabees.

ANSWER.

It is a common Opinion among learned Men, that all the Sects of the Jews had their Beginning after the Death of their Prophets. And this is ſubſtantially proved by *Curæus, lib.* 2. *c.* 17. *de Repub. Hebræorum*; But how long after their Deaths, is a very great Queſtion; as *Pfeiffer* ſays, *Exercit.* 4*ta.* ſpeaking of the Phariſees.

Caſaubon in his firſt *Exercit.* againſt *Baronius*, quotes *Joſephus, lib.* 13. *c.* 9. for mentioning the Phariſees, Sadduces, and Eſſenes, in the Affairs of *Jonathan Aſmonæus*, 140 Years before the Nativity of Chriſt. The ſame *Joſephus, lib.* 18. *c.* 2. affirms, that thoſe three Sects,

Sects, or as he calls them, Philoſophies, were known to the Jews, ἐν τῷ πάνυ ἀρχαίῳ, which the Tranſlator renders, *multis retro ſæculis*, many Ages paſt.

Of all their Sects the Sadduces are the moſt ancient, and *Caſaubon* in the place cited thinks the Phariſees to be ſoon after them. *Antigonus Sochæus* (whoſe Diſciple *Zadoch*, the Author of the Sect of the Sadduces was) ſucceeded *Simeon* the Juſt, whom the Jews commonly, and among them *Abraham Zacuth*, makes to be the ſame with *Jaddus* that went out to meet *Alexander* 330 Years before Chriſt. So that Mr. *Blount* ſeems to be ſomewhat miſtaken as to the Antiquity of theſe Sects.

Pag. 158. *The Introduction of thoſe Sects, and of that Caballa, occaſioned that Expoſition of the Prophecy of* Jacob, *viz.* The Scepter ſhall not depart from *Judah*, nor a Law-giver between his Feet, until *Shiloh* come, and unto him ſhall the gathering of the People be; *from whence they did (according to that fantaſtick Caballa) imagine, that whenſoever the Scepter ſhould depart from* Judah, *and the Dominion thereof ceaſe, that then there ſhould arrive a* Meſſiah.

ANSWER.

The Expoſition of this Place with reſpect to the *Meſſiah* is evident from the Conſent of the Ancient Jews, who never underſtood it in any other manner. All the old *Paraphraſts*, call, *Shilo* the *Meſſias*; the *Targum* of *Jeruſalem* renders it expreſly untill the time, when King *Meſſiah* ſhall come. *Jonathan* renders it untill the time when *Meſſiah* ſhall come. *Onkelos* untill *Meſſiah* come, whoſe is the Kingdom. The *Talmud* alſo reckons *Shilo*, among the Names of the *Meſſiah*. *Hoornbeck* writing of the Converſion of the Jews, reckons the Concurrence of divers Rabbies to this Interpretation: And to the ſame purpoſe, *Morney du Pleſsis*, in his Book of the *Truth of Chriſtian Religion*, *cap.* 27. all which Authorities aſſure us, that the Ancient Jews underſtood this Propheſy of the *Meſſias*; and that this was no Imagination, according to a *Fantaſtick Cabbala*, as is wickedly ſuggeſted.

The truth of this expoſition is Confirmed, by the Words which follow, *To him ſhall the gathering of the People be.* For this is the ſame Character, by which he was declared to *Abraham*, *In thy Seed ſhall all the Nations of the Earth be bleſſed.* He was ſignified alſo by this Character in the Prophet *Iſaiah*, *In that day there ſhall be a Root of* Jeſſe, *which ſhall ſtand for an Enſign of the People*; *to it ſhall the* Gentiles

tiles *ſeek, and his reſt ſhall be Glorious.* As alſo in the Prophet *Micah*, *The Mountain of the Houſe of the Lord ſhall be Eſtabliſhed on the top of the Mountains, and it ſhall be Exalted above the Hills, and the People ſhall flow unto it.*

And thus the Bleſſing of *Judah* is plainly underſtood, Judah *thou art He whom thy Brethren ſhall praiſe. Thy hand ſhall be in the Neck of thine Enemies, thy Fathers Children ſhall bow down before thee.*

Now this Bleſſing was to make way for a greater. This Government was not to fail, until there came a Son out of *Judah*'s Loyns greater than Him. For whereas *Judah*'s Dominion reached only to the Tribes of *Iſrael*; the Dominion of Him who came out of His Loyns ſhould be over the World, all Nations ſhall ſerve him.

Seeing then that this Expoſition is not only according to the ancient *Jews*, but according to the Scriptures themſelves: How greatly hath Mr. *Blount* erred, in affirming that this Expoſition was occaſioned by the introduction of Sects among the *Jews*.

Page 158. *As for the* Meſſias *being of the line of* David, *this was no general Opinion; for how then could any have imagined* Herod *the great to have been the* Meſſias *?*

ANSWER.

If this way of arguing be good, there is no general Opinion concerning any thing: *Leo Modena*, in his Hiſtory of the preſent *Jews*, (p. 249.) acquaints us, that the 12th. Article of their Belief is, *That the* Meſſias *is yet to come.* And *Modena* pag. 247. ſays, that this is one of thoſe Articles, which are generally believed by all *Jews* without contradiction. Yet *Iſaac Voſſius*, p. 226. of the *Sibilline Oracles*, tells us, *Ne nunc quidem inter* Judæos *deſint, qui* Herodem *pro* Meſſia *admittant*; *There are not wanting now ſome among the* Jews, *who affirm that* Herod *was the* Meſſias. Is there any Opinion more general than that of the Exiſtence of *God*, yet ſome Philoſopers have deny'd it? Have there not been ſome Prodigies in Nature, who denied that there was any ſuch thing in the World as Motion? yet nothing can be more evident. *Ariſtotle* in his *Metaphyſicks* diſputes againſt ſome, who deny'd that it imply'd a Contradiction, for the ſame thing to be, and not to be at the ſame time: εἰσὶ δὲ τινες οἳ αὐτά τε ἐνδέχεσθαι φάσι τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι: Yet I preſume moſt men think the contrary to be a general Opinion. In a word, this Method of Argumentation uſed by our Author, is very ridiculous: For what *Tully*, in his Books *de nat. Deorum*, ſpeaks, is very manifeſt: *Nihil tam abſurdum quod non dixerit aliquis Philoſophorum*; *Nothing*

thing contained ſo great an abſurdity, but ſome Philoſopher or other would contend for it.

Pag. 158. *How could* Joſephus *fix that Character upon* Veſpaſian, *as Him who ſhould reſtore the Empire and glory of* Iſrael, *to whom all Nations ſhould bow and ſubmit unto his Scepter?*

ANSWER.

Joſephus ſought the Favour of the *Romans*, and He was kindly uſed by them; ſo that 'tis not ſo ſtrange He ſhould interpret *Oracles* in Favour of *Veſpaſian*: None of the *Jews* beſides Him did ſo.

Philoſtratus ſays, That *Apollonius Tianæus* was familiar with *Veſpaſian*; and He indeed apply'd the *Oracles* of the *Meſſias*, or *King* promiſs'd to *Veſpaſian*: but He was a vain *Sycophant*, a *Magician*, and in this very ridiculous.

But notwithſtanding their Flatteries, *Veſpaſian* was of another Mind. He was perſwaded that the *Oracle* did belong to one of the Jewiſh Nation, and of *David*'s Family; wherefore He made it his Buſineſs to deſtroy the whole Race of that Family, as *Euſebius* informs us, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. and 12.

Page 158. *I do not read that the* Jews *harboured any ſuch Expoſition during their Captivity under* Nebuchadnezzar, *albeit that the Scepter was at that time ſo deprived from the Tribe of* Judah, *that it was never reſettled in it more.*

ANSWER.

I have already made it plain, that the authentick Paraphrasts of the *Jews* understand it, in this sense, as also *God*'s holy Prophets. Our Author takes for granted, That there should always be a King of the Tribe of *Judah*, until the Coming of the *Messiah*: which is not affirmed by the Prophesy. We readily acknowledge that Judah was not a Kingdom, till the Coming of the *Messiah*: for there was no kingly Authority in Judah before *David*, nor after *Zedekiah*. Unless you perhaps count the *Macchabees* (of whose Tribe there is some dispute, as *DuPlessis Morney* assures us, *c.* 29. of his book of the truth of the *Christian Religion*) or *Herod*, who was an *Idumæan*. The Meaning therefore of the Prophesy is, Not that Judah should have a *King* till the *Messiah* came, or that it should not cease to be a Kingdom; but that it should not cease to be a State, a Body Politick, having Power of Government within its self, until Messiah came. Wherefore the Seventy, for *Sceptrum*, a Scepter, translate Ἀρχων, a Ruler, not Βασιλευς a King. οὐκ ἐκλείψει Ἀρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα; a Governour should not fail to be in Judah. It should not cease to be a Government, altho' it had no King of that Title. It cannot be said that the Scepter departs from the *Poles*, whether the Elector of *Saxony*, or Prince of *Conti* enjoy it

And to this purpose *Episcopius* in his Institutions truly asserts, *Nec dubitandum quin respublica ista*,

ista, quando ei præerant Levitæ Hasmonæi, aut Herodes Idumæus, aut quicunque alius, eamque ex legibus & more populi regebant, respublica semper manserit populi Judaici, *eaque nomenclatura ubique venerit ut ex historia temporum manifestum est:* 'Tis not to be doubted but that it was the Republick of Jewry, when the *Hasmonean* Levites presided, or *Herod* the *Idumean*, or whosoever else govern'd according to the Laws and Customs of the People of Jewry. This Republick so long continued, and it had that Denomination, as is manifest out of History. The forecited Honor. *Du Plessis*, in the 29.c. positively and truly affirms, *Quod ipsi* Sanhedrin *seu* Juces 70. *quos R.* Moses Hadarsan *ante adventum* Messiæ *non desituros dicebat, sub* Assyriorum *jugo & sub* Macchabæorum *Principatu perseverabant:* 'The *Sanhedrin*, or 70 Judges, whom *Rabbi Moses Hadarsan* asserted, should not cease till the the Coming of the *Messiah*, continued under the Bondage of the *Assyrians*, and the Government of the *Macchabees*. He also adds, *In ipsa captivitate habuerunt perpetuo* Judæi *suum* Reschgaluta, *id est Principem exulum ex tribu* Juda, *exque ipsa* Davidis *stirpe, quod* Judæorum *Historiæ testantur:* 'The Jewish Historians testify, That when they were in Captivity, they had their Prince of the Tribe of *Judah*, of the Family of *David*. And yet Mr. *Blount*, contrary to all these Authorities, peremptorily says, That the Scepter in the Captivity under *Nebuchadnezzar*, so departed from the Tribe of *Judah*, as

that

that it was never reſetled in it more: A plain Argument He had not well conſidered Revealed Religion, which ſo ignorantly he impugns.

Pag. 159. *Other Prophecies are either general, and indefinitly expreſt, as to the time of their accompliſhment; or inexplicable from their obſcurity, or uncertain as to their Authority: ſuch as are the Weeks of* Daniel, *which Book the* Jews *reckon among their* Hagiographa, *or Sacred, but not Canonical Books.*

ANSWER.

The Propheſies of the Prophet *Daniel*, which expreſly point at the time of the *Meſſiah*'s Coming, and concur with our JESUS, are very conſiderable. The Prophely in the 9th. of *Daniel*, ver. 24, 25 and 26. *Seventy Weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finiſh the tranſgreſſion, and to make an end of ſins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in the everlaſting righteouſneſs, and to ſeal up the viſion and propheſy, and to anoint the moſt holy:* Ver. 25. *Know therefore and underſtand, that from the going forth of the commandment, to reſtore and rebuild* Jeruſalem, *unto the* Meſſiah *the Prince, ſhall be ſeven weeks, and threeſcore and two weeks; the ſtreet ſhall be built again, and the war, even in troublous times:* Ver. 26. *And after threeſcore and two weeks ſhall* Meſſiah *be cut off, but not for Himſelf; and the people of the Prince*

that

that ſhall come, ſhall deſtroy the city, and the ſanctuary, and the end thereof ſhall be with a flood, and unto the ends of the war deſolations are determined: Ver. 27. *And he ſhall confirm the Covenant with many for one week, and in the midſt of the week, he ſhall cauſe the ſacrifice and oblation to ceaſe, and for the overſpreading of Abominations; he ſhall make it deſolate, even until the conſummation, and that determined ſhall be poured upon the deſolate.*

This Propheſy is clearly meant of the *Meſſiah*, becauſe here we have not only his Name, but his Sufferings; and the account of his Sufferings, not for himſelf, but the People. The ancient Jews underſtood this place of the *Meſſiah: Hoornbeck* to this purpoſe tells us, that R. *Saadias a gaon*, Rabbi *Naahman Gerundenſis*, and divers others expound this place of the *Meſſias*. At laſt he gives us *Manaſſe Ben Iſrael*, which being very material, I ſhall quote it at large out of him: *Verum ut addam illud interpretationis hujus prophetiæ, varie etiam illa ab hujus ævi* Hebræis *explicata eſt, neque illud mirum cuique videre debet, ſi in prophetia tam obſcura variant ſententiæ.* 'But 'that I might add this of the Interpretation of 'this Propheſy, for this is variouſly expounded 'by the *Hebrews* of this Age: neither let this be 'a wonder to any, if there be a difference of opi-'nions in ſo obſcure a Propheſy. There are therefore thoſe who take theſe 70 weeks ſo, that they ſay, After the end of them the *Meſſiah* is to come, who would conſtitute the Jews Lords of the whole Earth. And this truly all

thoſe

thoſe did imagine, that took arms againſt the *Roman* Emperour: and altho' they were obnoxious to many miſeries and labours, yet notwithſtanding they always placed their hope in the *Meſſias* that was to come; becauſe they thought he would afford the ſight of himſelf when they were in the midſt of their miſeries: wherefore theſe words, *To finish tranſgreſſions*, they expounded, That after the expiration of 70 weeks, ſins are pardoned. Thus far *Hoornbeck* out of *Menaſſe Ben Iſrael*.

We have here an evident teſtimony, that the Jews that lived about the time of the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, looked for the *Meſſias* then to come, becauſe they thought *Daniel*'s Period was then ended; and tho' (by miſtake) they expected a temporal Prince, yet 'tis evident they thought this Propheſy did concern the time, when the *Meſſias* ſhould come. That which is moſt difficult here, is, the direct time of the *Meſſias*'s cutting off, is told us under the name of ſo many Weeks; which are not to be underſtood in our common acceptation of the word, but are to be taken for Years. The word *Weeks* in holy Scripture ſignifieth ſometime the ſpace of ſeven Days, as here in this Propheſy, 10. ch. ver. 2. where *Daniel* ſays, 'That he mourned three 'Weeks, or ſevenets of Days: And in the 16. of *Deuteron.* 9. ver. where commandment is given, 'Seven Weeks ſhalt thou number unto thee: 'begin to number the ſeven Weeks from ſuch 'time as thou beginneſt to put the ſickle to the 'corn.

The

The word *Weeks* is ſometime taken for Years in Scripture, and containeth ſeven Years: As in the 29. chap. *Geneſ.* ver. 27. 'Fulfil her 'Week, and we will give thee this alſo, for the 'ſervice which thou ſhalt ſerve with me yet 'ſeven other Years. As alſo *Leviticus* ch. 25. ver. 8. ¶ 'And thou ſhalt number ſeven Sabbaths 'of Years unto thee, ſeven times ſeven Years, 'and the ſpace of the ſeven Sabbaths of Years 'ſhall be unto thee forty and nine Years.

The Greek Word ἑβδομάς, in approved Authors, is in like manner uſed, not only for ſeven Days, but alſo for ſeven Years ſpace; as in the end of the 7th Book of *Ariſtotle's* Politicks, where mention is made of ſuch as divided Ages by Sevenets of Years. Οἱ γὰρ ταῖς ἑβδόμασι διαιροῦντες τὰς ἡλικίας. And *Varro* in his firſt Book of Images, writeth, *Se jam duodecimam annorum hebdomadam ingreſſum eſſe*; That he had now entred into the twelfth Sennet of Years: which Expreſſion is plain and full.

In this Signification the Word is to be taken in this place, underſtanding by 70 Sevennets, 490 Years, having Proof thereof from Holy Scripture, and Prophane Authors.

And to thoſe before-mentioned we may add, *Cenſorinus de die Natali*, *c.* 14. and *Macrobius*, Book firſt, *in Somnium Scipionis*, *c.* 6.

As for thoſe who ſtretch the Word further to a Sevenet of Tenths, or Jubilies, or Hundreds of Years, as ſome have done, their Opinion

pinion hath neither warrant of God's Word, nor any likelyhood of Truth.

The greateſt Difficulty is about the Beginning of thoſe Weeks, concerning which we need not ſay any thing, conſidering that thoſe muſt be wilfully blind that deny the completion thereof.

But our Author is not to be born withal, as to what he ſays concerning the Prophecy's Authority; and that the Jews reckon it not among their Canonical Books.

Father *Simon*, who had well weighed this Point in his Critical Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament, Book 1. Chap. 9. ſays, *There are many learned Men who find fault, that the Jews exclude* Daniel *from the number of the Prophets, and* Theodoret *hath reproved them very ſeverely.* But it is eaſie to reconcile their Opinion in this Point, with that of the Chriſtians, ſince they agree, that the Books of the Bible which are called Canonical, have been equally inſpired by God; and moreover, that the Book of *Daniel* is of the number of theſe Canonical Books.

Joſephus, in the Tenth Book of his Antiquities, Chap. 12. writing of *Daniel*, ſays, θεῖον ἀυτου ἀυτῷ πνεῦμα συμπάρεσι, That he was endued with a Divine Spirit, and that he was of the number of μεγίσων προφητων. He was one of the greateſt Prophets, that his Books were read by the Jews, which abundantly demonſtrated that he converſed with God.

For

For he did not only foretel things to come to paſs as the other Prophets did, but he determined the very time in which they were to be fulfilled. And whereas other Prophets predicted Calamities, and ſo loſt their Eſteem among the Princes and the People; He foretold Good Things to come, by which he conciliated the Favour of all Perſons; and as for the certainty of Events, he obtained a Belief amongſt all Men.

Porphiry the Philoſopher, the Scholar of *Plotinus*, and cotemporary with *Origen*, who made it his Buſineſs to refel the Propheſies of *Daniel*; when he found all things ſo punctually delivered, as that there was no place for a Refutation, he finally aſſumed the Impudence to affirm, that not *Daniel*, but an Impoſtor under his Name, who lived in the time of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, Publiſhed theſe Prophecies. And this his Impudence was much more tolerable than that of Mr. *Blount*'s, who aſſerts, that *Daniel*'s 70 Weeks were uncertain as to their Authority.

Pag. 162. *He never evinced his Genealogy from* David; *for tho' ſome mean Perſons called him the Son of* David, *and the Mobb by that Title did cry Hoſannah to him, yet did he acquieſce in terming himſelf the Son of Man. As alſo when he made his Cavalcade upon an Aſinego, they extolled him as the Deſcendant of King* David.

AN-

ANSWER.

This is a very bold Stroke; Infidelity unmasked! To what purpoſe ſhould our Saviour evince his Genealogy from *David?* The honourable *Du Pleſſis*, Chap. 30. obſerves, *Nuſquam in Evangelio exprobratum Jeſu legamus, quod ex ſtirpe Davidis, ſeu ex tribu Juda oriundus noneſſet, ſed quod fabri filius, ut diuturnæ Davidicæ domus erumnæ ad inopiam nonnullos redegerant.* We never read in the Goſpel that our Lord was upbraided with his not being of the Tribe of *Judah*, or Lineage of *David*; it was objected, that he was a Carpenters Son, for the Miſeries that had befallen the Houſe of *David*, had reduced ſome of that Family to great Penury. Agreeable hereunto is that of *Epiſcopius, lib. 3. Inſtit. Jeſum Noſtrum ex tribu Judæ ortum duxiſſe nemo circa iſta tempora quibus diſcipuli ejus vivebant, dubitavit.* That our Lord Jeſus ſprang out of the Tribe of *Judah*, no one doubted in the Days of his Diſciples. The Jews did all acknowledge it, as appears by the Queſtion of our Saviour; *How ſay the* Scribes *that Chriſt is the Son of* David? *What think ye of Chriſt? Whoſe Son is he?* They ſay unto him, *The Son of* David.

The Genealogy of Jeſus ſhews his Family; the firſt Words of the Goſpel are, *The Book of the Generation of Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of* David. The Apoſtle in his 7th Chapter of the *Hebrews*,

Hebrews, Verſe 14. *For it is evident that our Lord ſprang out of* Judah.

Benjamine Tudelenſis (whom *Abraham Zacuth* in his *Chronicon* calls the great Luminary) in his *Itinerary* affirms, that the very Mahometans call the Meſſiah the Son of *David*. How impious is our Author then in this Expreſſion, *That they were but mean Perſons that called him the Son of* David! How blaſphemous he is in his Expreſſion of the Mobb, the Cavalcade on the Aſinego, is manifeſt to all thoſe that have any Reverence for the Holy Goſpel and the Prophets?

Pag. 164. *It is apparent that not only the Jews, but alſo the Chriſtians were Millenaries, and did believe and expect the Temporal Reign of a Meſſiah, together with the Union of the Jews and Gentiles under one moſt happy Monarchy.*

ANSWER.

It muſt be granted, that many eminent Perſons for Sanctity, favoured the Millenaries. But if we impartially examin this matter, we ſhall find that it wholly reſts on the Authority of *Papias*, who pretended Apoſtolical Tradition. Now of what Authority this Author was, I report from the Words of *Caſaubon*, in his 16th Exercitation, Number 74. *Narrat Euſebius in tertio Hiſtoriarum, papiam hunc Scriptorem fuiſſe futiliſſimum, qui omnes traditionum fabellas mirifice amplecteretur, & ſcriptis Manda-*

ret. *Multa igitur falsa absurdaque de Christo & Apostolis scripsisse ; & quædam etiam fabulis propriora. Eusebius* declares, in the third Book of his *History*, that this *Papias* was a most trifling Scribler, who embraced all manner of fabulous Traditions, and committed them to Writing. He writ many false things of Christ and the Apostles ; and some of his Narrations look more like Dreams and Fables then true History— And in that number *Casaubon* gives a pregnant Instance out of *Oecumenius*.

Now, as *Papias* pretended this Tradition to come from the Apostles, so he did nothing but what others in those primitive times were wont to do. It was usual for Sectaries to boast that they taught the Doctrine of the Apostles, or at least their Disciples.

We read in *Clemens Alexand* (*lib. 7. Strom.*) That *Basilides*, an ancient Heretick, boldly avouched, that he had for his Master *Glaucias*, St. *Peter*'s Interpreter ; and that *Valentinus* affirmed with the like boldness, that he had been instructed in Religion by *Theodad*, who was one of Saint *Paul*'s familiar Acquaintance.

It would be difficult to show the difference in the Cases before-mentioned ; and consequently this Tradition of *Papias* may be as well rejected, as that of *Basilides*, or that of *Valentinus* ; and that Tradition can be no certain Rule for us to walk by.

Pag.

Pag. 165. *Not one of the two first Ages dissented from the Opinion of the Millenaries; and they who oppose it, never quote any for themselves before* Dionysius Alexandrinus, *who lived (at least)* 250 *Years after Christ. Of this Opinion was* Justin Martyr, *and* (as he says) *all other Christians that were exactly Orthodox.* Irenæus *relates the very Words which Christ used when he taught this Doctrine*— This Pretence and Millenary Invention stopt the Mouths of the Unbelieving Jews.

ANSWER.

It is a great Boldness to affirm, that not one of the two first Centuries opposed this Opinion; For how could our *Deist* know this, when so many Monuments of Antiquity relating to the first Centuries are lost? This Method I remember to be used by Bishop *Pearson*, in the Defence of *Ignatius*'s Epistles.

It is certain that in the first and second Ages there were some that denied the Book of the *Revelations* to be Canonical Scripture, and that the Author thereof was *Cerinthus* the Heretick, and not St. *John*; and there was no reason that induced them to think so, besides this Doctrine of *Milleranism*. *Nepos*, an Egyptian Bishop, was a great defender of this Opinion; he writ a Book (about the Year of our Lord 244.) in defence of it; he Titles his Book, *a Reproof of the* Allegorists. By that Name

he called the Antimillenaries; ſo that the Opponents of the Millenaries muſt have been then conſiderable, their Nickname is ſufficient Demonſtration thereof.

'Tis very ſurprizing to hear our Deiſt affirm, that they who oppoſe this Opinion never quote any for themſelves before *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*: Foraſmuch as the ſame *Dionyſius*, in *Euſebius* (*lib.* 7. *c.* 25.) affirms that ſome who Preceeded him rejected the Book of the *Revelations* upon that account.

Beſides the Defenders of this Doctrine kept it as ſecret as they poſſibly could. *Non defendere hanc Doctrinam* (ſays *Lactant. lib. de vit. Beat.*) *publice atque aſſerere ſolemus.* We are not wont to defend and aſſert this Doctrine publickly. 'Tis no wonder then if the Opponents of this Opinion were not ſo numerous. 'Tis alſo very plain that our *Deiſt* is miſtaken in the Deſign and firſt Contrivance of this Millenary Invention, as he calls it: Nay, *Lactantius*, *lib.* 7. *c.* 26. pretends there is a Command from God to keep this Doctrine in ſilence. Now if *Lactantius*, who was himſelf a Millenary, and well acquainted with their Methods, hath rightly informed us, our *Deiſt*'s Suggeſtions muſt be very weak.

We read in *Euſebius*, (*lib.* 7. *c.* 23.) how ſucceſsful *Dionyſius* was in overthrowing Milleraniſm; and that *Coracion*, a principal Man of that Party, was ſo convinced by him, as that He promiſed never to diſpute for that Doctrine

Doctrine more, never more to teach it, nor to make any mention of it.

If the Books of *Dionyſius* and *Nepos*, two of the greateſt and ableſt Writers of the reſpective Parties, were now extant, we could not fail of having a true Proſpect of this Controverſie; but their Books by the Injury of Times are periſhed. Upon which conſideration, if we had ſaid nothing elſe, this laſt Remark had been ſufficient to defeat Mr. *Blount*'s Argument drawn from the Silence of the two firſt Ages.

The various reading of the much celebrated place in *Juſtin Martyr* relating to the Millenaries, leaves us in Uncertainties: But we are confident (after a diligent Examination) that *Irenæus* no where pretends (as our *Deiſt* bears us in hand that he did) to relate the very Words which Chriſt uſed when he delivered this Doctrine. Beſides that which is a prejudice never to be overcome, is the Silence of the Goſpel in ſo important a Matter.

Our Author is frequent in quoting Councils as well as Fathers for Heterodoxies: what reaſon there ſhould be for his not citing any Councils in this Caſe, no not ſo much as *Gelaſius Cyzicenus*, in reference to the *Nicene* Council, I cannot account for; I can only accouut for my ſelf, & declare, that what general, or ancient Prov. Coun. have done in this caſe, whether they have approved it or condemned it, I do not know, neither am I aſhamed ſo to confeſs: For *Scaliger*

(in his *Exercit.* 345.) calls, *verbum Neſcio, ingenui candidique animi pignus.*

In the beginning of the Reformation, there were ſome who endeavoured to give Countenance to this Opinion; wherefore our Church then paſſed a ſevere Cenſure on ſuch Perſons. For in a Convocation at *London*, in the Year of our Lord, 1552. in the laſt Article ſave one, the Millenaries are called Hereticks.

The Article is as followeth:

They that go about to renew the Fable of the Hereticks, *called* Millenarii, *be repugnant to Holy Scripture, and caſt themſelves headlong into a* Jewiſh *Dotage.*

This Article is to be ſeen in the Collection of Articles, Injunctions, *&c.* (*p.* 52.) Prefaced by the Learned Biſhop *Sparrow.* I ſay Prefaced, becauſe the Author of the *Antopology*, (*p.* 56.) informs us, that the ſaid Biſhop told him, 'That he was not the Collector; 'and that if he had been concerned in the 'Collection, he would have publiſhed more 'Materials.

The latter part of this Information ſeems very probable; foraſmuch as the ſaid excellent Prelat was moſt accurate in Matters of this nature.

From

From what hath been ſaid concerning this Subject, we may ſufficiently diſcover Mr. *Blount*'s Vanity; when, (*p.* 169.) he affirms that there was as Univerſal a Tradition for Milleraniſm in the Primitive Times, as for any Article of our Faith: Whereas there is no Article of our Faith but may be tried and proved by that Golden Rule of *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*, —*Quod omnibus, quod ſemper, quod ubique*; the Articles of our Faith have been received by all Orthodox Perſons, at all Times, and in all Places; which cannot be ſaid of Milleraniſm. We acknowledge no Articles of Faith, but ſuch only as can be proved by Holy Scriptures; and to ſuch Articles the Rule of *Vincentius* is only competent.

This I conceive to be the Senſe of our Convocation, in the Year of our Lord, 1562. (*Collect. Artic. p.* 92.) when they define that all Articles of Faith are grounded on thoſe Canonical Books of Holy Scripture; of whoſe Authority there was never any doubt in the Church. I think I may not be importune and unreaſonable, if I relate the whole Article.

Holy Scripture *containeth all things neceſſary to Salvation: So that whatſoever is not Read therein, nor may be Proved thereby, is not to be re-*

quired of any Man, that it ſhould be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation in the Name of the Holy Scripture, *we do underſtand thoſe Canonical Books of the Old and New Teſtament, of whoſe Authority there never was any doubt in the Church.*

SECT.

SECT. IX.

Of Augury. Of a God. Origin of Good and Evil, plurality of Worlds, Natural Religion, Ocellus Lucanus.

PAg. 167. Augury *is a ſort of the ancient heatheniſh Superſtition: And* Pag. 169. *We may ſee that Superſtition, like Fire, endeavours to reſolve all things into it ſelf.*

ANSWER.

Mr. *Blount* hath given us ſome Account of the Pagan Superſtition of *Augury*; out of which it appears how inſufficient Natural Religion is of it ſelf, and how neceſſary Revealed Religion is, to ſhew the vanity of theſe Abominations. To this purpoſe very remarkable is that of *Alexander ab Alexandro*, in the end of his laſt Book *Dierum genialium: Quantum debemus Chriſto Domino Regi & Doctori noſtro, quem verum Deum veneramur & ſcimus, quo præmonſtrante exploſa monſtroſa ferarum gentium doctrina rituque immani ac barbaro, veram religionem edocti, humanitatem & verum Deum colimus, evictiſque erroribus & infandis ineptiis, quas priſci coluere, quid quemque deceat & quibus ſacris quaque mente,*

mente, Deum colere oporteat noſcitamus? 'How 'much do we owe to *Chriſt* our King and Ma- 'ſter, whom we acknowledge and worſhip as 'true God, by whoſe guidance and direction, 'the monſtrous Doctrine, and barbarous Rites 'of theſe ſavage Nations being chaſed away; 'and we being taught true Religion, imbrace 'Civility and the true God: and the errors and 'unſpeakable follies which the Ancients had 'in honour and reverence, being brought to 'light, we know what our duty is, with what 'Ceremonies, and what mind God is to be wor- 'ſhipped. Which is in effect the ſame with that of the Apoſtle, *Coloſ.* 1. ver. 13. 'Thanks 'be to God, who hath delivered us from the 'power of darkneſs, and tranſlated us into the 'Kingdom of his dear Son. Now this of *Alexander* is the more to be remark'd; foraſmuch as *Augury*, the Art of *Divination*, *Aſtrology*, *Southſaying*, and the like Superſtitions, like a univerſal contagion, had infected all Mankind (ſave only where Reveal'd Religion had obtained) as *Tully* tells us in his firſt Book *de Divinatione*: *Qua eſt autem gens, aut quæ civitas, quæ non aut extis pecudum, aut monſtra, aut fulgura interpretantium, aut Augurum, aut Aſtrologorum, aut Sortium (ea enim fere Artis ſunt) aut Somniorum, aut Vaticinationum, hæc enim duo naturalia putantur prædictione moveatur:* 'There could 'not be named any Nation or City, which 'abounded not with theſe Abominations, and 'was not moved with the Predictions of thoſe

'who

'who pretend to interpret Prodigies and Light-'nings; or with the Predictions of the Augurs, 'or Aſtrologers, or Oracles (in theſe there was 'ſomething of Art) or with the foreboding of 'Dreams, and Accidents, which two laſt may have ſomething Natural.

What Mr. *Blount* could promiſe himſelf by his Account of *Augury*, I cannot imagine; but I am perſwaded he could not think of any thing, which would prove more diſadvantagious to his Deſign in general, than this Subject.

Pag. 170. *From the Pagan Proceſſions, the manner of the* Chriſtians *going in Proceſſion was thought to be firſt taken.*

ANSWER.

Our Author is much miſtaken as to the Inſtitution of Proceſſions. *Gregory Turonenſis, lib.* 11. *Hiſt. cap.* 37. gives us this Account: *Refert* Avitus *in quadam homilia, quam de Rogationibus ſcripſit, has ipſas Rogationes quos ante Aſcenſionis Domini triumphum celebrantus, a* Mamerto *ipſius* Viennenſis *Urbis, cui & hic eo tempore præerat, inſtitutas fuiſſe, dum Urbs ipſa multis terreretur prodigiis*: 'Avitus reports in a certain Homily of 'his, which he writ of *Rogations*; That *Ma-'mertus* Biſhop of *Vienna*, inſtituted thoſe *Roga-'tions* or Proceſſions, which we celebrate be-'fore our Lord's *Aſcenſion*. Out of the ſaid Homily we have this occaſion of their Inſtitution; That it was appointed for diverting

God's

God's diſpleaſure, foraſmuch as in thoſe times there were great Earthquakes, Incurſions of Wolves and wild Beaſts, frequent Fires, terrible Sounds by night, to the extream terrrour of the People. Wherefore the ſaid Biſhop, knowing no better expedient to divert ſo ſevere a Chaſtiſement, than Faſting and Humiliation, ordered thoſe Days for that intent; and contrived a *Litany* apt and ſuitable for ſuch humble Addreſs. This pious courſe taking good effect, ſucceeding times continued it in their Anniverſary practice; ſo that the firſt Council of *Orleans* eſtabliſhed it by a Decree, in their 23. Canon: Which Cuſtom having had ſo long footing in the Church, our Reformers were loth to be ſingular in reſcinding of it: and the rather becauſe they obſerved that it fell caſually and beyond its firſt intention, upon ſuch a Seaſon as might be very agreeable to the Service of thoſe days. For this being the Critical time of the Year, when all the Fruits of the Earth are in greateſt hazard of miſcarrying, by Froſts and unſeaſonable Weather; it is therefore exceeding proper to ſupplicate *God* for the withholding of his Judgments, and to implore his Bleſſing upon the Labours of the Husbandman. And altho' our Liturgy hath no ſet Office, yet our Church hath ſet Homilies for it. And in the *Injunctions an.* 1559. and *Advertiſements an.* 7. *Elizab.* it was ordered, 'That in the *Rogation* 'Days of Proceſſion, the Curat ſing, or ſay in '*Engliſh* the two Pſalms, beginning *Benedic ani-*

'*ma*

'*na mea*, &c. with the *Litany*, and *Suffrages* 'thereunto belonging.

So that I conceive the greateſt Enemies our Church hath, cannot blemiſh our practice with Paganiſm or Superſtition.

Polydor Virgil de rerum Inventione, *lib.6. c.11.* derives their Original ſomewhat higher: *Ejuſmodi Proceſsionum uſum jam inde a principio apud noſtros fuiſſe, teſtimonio eſt* Tertullianus *libro ad Uxorem, quem forte intermiſſum* Mamertus *renovavit; & illos a* Judæis *mutuatos eſſe ſatis conſtat:* 'Theſe Proceſſions were in uſe among Chriſti-'ans from the very beginning of *Chriſtianity*, 'as *Tertulian* delivers in one of the Books, which 'he writ for his Wife: which cuſtom being 'long omitted, was at laſt brought into uſe a-'gain by *Mamertus*; and 'tis manifeſt that the 'Chriſtians borrowed it from the Jews.

The only Authors that I have read, that can give any countenance to this Imputation of Mr. *Blount*'s, are *Fromondus* in his *Meteors*, Book 5. ch.4. Artic. ſecond, where we are told, That in the place of the *Robigalia* and *Floralia*, the *Catholick* Church, inſtituted the Day of *Rogation*, and the Supplications and Proceſſions before *Aſcenſion-day*.

The other Author is Mr. *Gregory*, in his Notes on *Ridley*'s View of the Civil and Canon Law, p. 76. The old *Romans* inſtituted three yearly Solemnities, in the honour of their Gods, for the Fruits of the Earth: Theſe alſo the *Romiſh* Church obſerved, having firſt moderated

their

their Superſtition, and directed them to a more ſacred end.

How malicious then is this Suggeſtion of Mr. *Bloum*'s: His Argument is no more than this, That the *Chriſtians* who appointed Proceſſions and Seaſons, to pray to *God* for his Bleſſing on the Fruits of the Earth, are guilty of *Paganiſm*; becauſe the *Gentiles* were wont alſo to pray to their Idols for the like Bleſſing. This, I ſay, is the ſtrength of his Argument, upon ſuppoſition that Mr. *Gregory*, and *Fromondus* are not miſtaken; which they certainly are, with reſpect to their original Inſtitution.

Pag. 178. *I muſt beg Mr.* Lock's *Pardon, if I very much queſtion thoſe Authorities he quotes from the Travels of ſome Men, who affirm ſome Nations to have no notions of a* Deity; *ſince the ſame has been ſaid of the Inhabitants of the* Cape of Good Hope, *which the laſt Account of that place proves to be falſe*

ANSWER.

I muſt confeſs 'tis very difficult to perſwade a Mans ſelf, That the Idea of *God* is not innate: And if we reſpect Authority, with relation to ſome Nations having no notion of a *Deity*, My Lord Biſhop *Stillingfleet* is enough to ſtagger any Man's Belief to the contrary; who in his *Origines Sacræ* (p. 94.) poſitively aſſerts, *That of any whole Nation, which hath conſented in the denial of a* Deity, *we have no evidence at all.*

I

I muſt beg Pardon, with all deference to ſo great a Prelat, to tranſcribe a Paſſage out of *Vareniu*s, in his Treatiſe *de diverſis gentium Religionibus* (p. 238.) *De* Atheis *quidam dubitant, alii omnino exiſtere eos negant, atque cum* Cicerone *putant, nullos dari tam feros homines, qui non aliquem agnoſcant & venerentur Deum. Nos illos opponimus manifeſtam & cui cum judicio contradicere nequeunt experientiam. Multos ex* Græcis *Philoſophis homines, certe haud quaquam feros, negaſſe omnes ſpiritus & Dei exiſtentiam, vel ſaltem de iis dubitaſſe teſtantur antiquitatis Scriptores: & Protagoram quidem ab* Athenienſibus *eam ob cauſam civitate pulſum eſſe* Diogenes Laertius, *& alii clare affirmant. Non jam dicam de illis, qui quanquam inter* Chriſtianos *verſantur, tamen* Athei *ſunt, ſed de remotis populis agemus. In Deſcriptione Religionis* Japonenſis *narravimus, tam ex* Jeſuitarum, *quam* Belgarum *annotationibus, quod multi hic reperiantur, qui nullam divinitatem credant; nempe illos, qui ex* Jenxuana *hæreſi ſunt. Præter boſce dari feros et Sylveſtres populos (quorum plerique ſunt* Anthropophagi *et ſine ulla Republica) qui nullam* Dei *cognitionem habeant ſatis ſuperque per navigationes comprobatum eſt, nimirum in populis totius* Braſiliæ, *populis circa Fretum* Magellanicum, *ad Promontorium* Bonæ Spei, *parte Inſulæ,* Sumatra Auſtrali, *item in* Madagaſcare *inſula et* Hornanis *inſulis ad* Novam Guineam. *Etenim qui navigationem* Navarchi Le Maire *circa totam tellurem per fretum ab eodem* Le Maire *dictum deſcripſit, atque in hiſce inſulis multos dies com-*

commoratus est, ita loquitur: Non potuimus, inquit, ex ullis judiciis colligere, quod hic populus aliquem Deum *colat: vivunt sine omni cura, ut aves in sylvis, neque tendendi, vel emendi illis mos est; neque serunt, neque metunt, nec aliis laboribus fatigantur.*

De Brasilianis Anthropophagis *narrant historiæ, cum* Europæi *aliquando sumpta occasione a vehementi tonitru, existentiam* Dei *huic genti persuadere conarentur, illos non erubuisse impudenter respondere, talem Deum nequam esse oportere, utpote cui volupe esset, hominibus terrorem incutere.* Considering that this Treatise of *Varenius* speaks pertinently to our present purpose, and that this Book is not in every Man's hand, I have transcribed this Passage at large; and I here translate it.

'Some doubt, others absolutely deny that 'there are any *Atheists*; and are of *Cicero*'s mind, 'that no Men are so barbarous, but that they ac- 'knowledge and venerate a *GOD*. But we op- 'pose to such manifest Experience, which no 'judicious Person can contradict. Many of the '*Greek* Philosophers, and certainly not barba- 'rous, have deny'd all Spirits, and the Existence 'of a *God*, or at least have doubted thereof, as 'Historians bear witness. And *Protagoras* was 'banished by the *Athenians* for that cause, as '*Diogenes Laertius* and others testify.

'I will say nothing of such as live among '*Christians*, and yet are *Atheists*; but of remote 'People, in the Description of the Religion of

'*Japan*

'*Japan*, we have delivered out of the Annota-
'tations of the *Jesuites*, and the *Hollanders*, that
'there are many among them to be found, who
'deny the being of any *God*; *viz.* those who
'are of the *Jenxuan* Heresy. Besides those there
'are many barbarous People (many of whom
'are *Man-eaters*, and without any form of Go-
'vernment) who have no knowledge of *God* at
'all; as is over and above proved by Naviga-
'tors: to wit, the People of all *Brasile*, the
'People who live about the *Magellanick* Sea,
'part of the People that live about the Cape
'of *Good hope*, South *Sumatra*, in the Isle of *Ma-*
'*dagascar*, and the *Hornane* Isles, about New
'*Guinee*. Truly he who described the Naviga-
'tion of *Le Maire* about the whole Earth, thro'
'the Sea, call'd from him *Le Maire*, and tarried
'in those Isles many days, thus writes, We could
'not by any signs gather that this People wor-
'shipp'd any *God:* They live without any care,
'as Birds in the Woods; they neither buy nor
'sell, they neither sow nor mow; neither are
'they wearied with any labour.

'Histories tell us concerniug those of *Brasil*,
'That when the *Europeans* took an occasion,
'from a terrible Thunder, to perswade this Na-
'tion to the Belief of a *God:* They were not
'ashamed impudently to answer, Such a *God*
'must needs be a wicked one, who took plea-
'sure to terrify poor Mortals

What Mr. *Lock* hath written of this Subject I have not read: I am sure if what *Varenius*

writes be true, That Mr. *Blount*'s whole *Hypotheſis* of *Natural Religion* is deſtroy'd, whoſe principal Foundation (page 195.) as he pretends, is, That there is one Infinite Eternal *God*, Creator of all things, and knowable by Innate *Idea's*, or elſe he ſays *Nothing to the purpoſe.*

Pag. 182. *But ſince our correſpondence with* China, *we have found they have Records and Hiſtories of four or ſix thouſand Years date, before our Creation of the World; and who knows but that ſome other Nations may be found out hereafter, that may go farther, and ſo on. Nay, the* Chineſe *themſelves in a Traditional account tell us, That the Poſterity of* Panzon, *and* Panzona *inhabited the Earth* 90000. *Years. The* Bramins *of* Guzarat *ſaid the Year* 1639. *that there had paſt* 326669. *Ages; each Age conſiſting of a number of* Years, *and if I miſtake not,* Centuries. *Nay, the* Egyptians *in the time of their King* Amaſis, *Contemporary with* Cyrus, *had the Records and Story of* 13000. *Years, and a ſucceſſion of* 330. *Kings, which ſhews they were not* Lunar *Years.*

ANSWER.

It may ſeem ſtrange that Mr. *Blount* makes no mention of *Dyrerius*, the Author of the *Præadamites*, to whom he is ſo much beholden; as he alſo was to *Salmaſius de Annis Climactericis:* The reaſon whereof I cannot think to be other than this, That he retracted his Opinion, as *Iſaac Voſſius* tells us in his Book *de Ætate Mundi*, cap. 12.

'Tis

'Tis a wonderful thing indeed the *Chineſe* ſhould have Records of ſix thouſand Years date, before the World began: For *Voſſius* aſſures us in his Book in his Treatiſe *de Artibus* Sinam. pag. 83. *Omnes* Sinenſium *libri continentes Hiſtoriam*, Matheſin, Aſtronomiam, Muſicam, *& complures alias Scientias, exceptis tamen iis qui ad* Agriculturam, *& rem* Medicam *pertinerent, combuſti fuere jam ante mille et nongentos annos juſſu Regis* Chingi, *multis quidem aliis celebrati operibus, et præſertim conſtructione vaſti iſtius muri, cujus fama implevit totum terrarum orbem:* 'All the Books 'of the *Chineſes*, which contain *Mathematicks*, '*Aſtronomy*, *Muſick*, and many other Arts and 'Sciences (excepting ſuch only as belong to '*Agriculture* and *Medicine*) were burnt a thou'ſand and nine hundred Year ſince, by the com'mand of their King *Chingi*, who was celebra'ted for his many great Works; and eſpecially 'for the great Wall, the fame of which hath 'fill'd the whole World. But peradventure their Records were incombuſtible, or reſerved in the great Wall, for the *Pre-adamites* alone to conſult.

But the miſchief of all is, That this King *Chingi* was an ambitious Prince, and for this end burnt all thoſe Hiſtories, that he might obliterate, and blot out of Men's Remembrance all the noble Acts of his Predeceſſors.

The ſame *Voſſius*, in his Caſtigations *ad Scriptum Hornii*, ch. 12. cites *Martinius*, who gives us an Account of their Traditional Antiquity:

Sciendum itaque extremam hanc Aſiam *primum ſeptem habuiſſe Imperatores, quorum ab Electione per ſuffragia ab anno nimirum ante* Chriſtum *natum* 2846, *uſque ad annum* 2207. *ante quæ tempora nihil veri ſe habuiſſe in ſuis Hiſtoriis fatentur* Sinæ, *deinde hæreditaria fuit ſucceſſio:* 'We muſt 'therefore know that this extreme Eaſtern 'part of *Aſia*, had firſt of all ſeven Emperors, 'who were created by the Election of the Peo- 'ple, before our *Chriſtian* computation 2846, 'even to the Year 1205. before which time the '*Chinenſes* have no true Hiſtorical Account, as 'they confeſs themſelves, and then their Go- 'vernment began to be hereditary. How vaſtly wide and different is this Account, from the Traditional account our Author gives us of the Poſterity of *Panzon* and *Panzona*, and from that of the *Bramins* of *Guzarat?*

Joſeph Scaliger, in his fifth Book *de Emendat. Tempor.* reckons the *Chineſes* among thoſe, *Qui veris hiſtoriæ monumentis deſtituti hinc multa annorum millia, & quædam immania temporum intervalla expreſſit ab illis tam temporum inſcitia quam vetuſtatis affectatio:* 'They were deſtitute of the 'true Monuments of Antiquity, and from hence 'it is that they boaſt of ſo many thouſand Years, 'and thoſe wonderful Intervals of time, which 'their Ignorance of Hiſtory, and their affecta- 'tion of Antiquity occaſioned.

From this Ignorance and Affectation, ſprang thoſe infinite *Dynaſteis* of the *Egyptians*, and thoſe

thoſe monſtrous Traditions of the *Chinenſes*, as have heard.

Beſides 'tis to be noted, we have no certain knowledge what kind of Year they uſed; which is neceſſary to be known, as before we obſerv'd concerning the *Moſaic* Hiſtory.

The Computation of *the Egyptians* is obnoxious to the ſame Objection: And whereas our Author ſays, They were not *Lunar*, 'tis not material; for each of the 330 Kings might reign a competent number of *Solar* Years, upon this his Suppoſition: And this any Man may perceive, that knows the difference between a *Solar* and a *Lunar* Year, as they are vulgarly underſtood. He that will defend the *Egyptian* Chronology, muſt of neceſſity underſtand ſome form of Years different from the *Moſaic*; as when they report of their ancient Kings, that ſome of them lived 300, ſome 1000 Years, and more, as we find in *Varro*, cited by *Lactantius*, Book 2. *Orig. Error. c.* 12. where altho' *Lactantius* differs ſomewhat from *Varro*, yet as to the thing it ſelf, they may be well enough reconciled. We ſhall therefore ſpeak of the *Egyptian* Year, forasmuch as *Macrobius*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. *Satur.* ſays, *Anni certus modus apud ſolos* Ægyptios, *aliarum gentium diſpari modo, pari errore mutantur*: 'The 'Egyptians are the beſt skill'd in *Chronology* of 'any Nations. For others, altho' in a different 'manner, yet they all err much in this particu-'lar. Wherefore if we demonſtrate the great variety and uncertainty that is among the *Egy-*

ptians in this point, we do (according to *Macrobius*) ſubvert the whole *Pagan Chronology*, and the Dreams of the *Preadamites*.

Plutarch, in the Life of *Numa Pompilius*, affirms, That before *Numa*, who added *January* and *February*, the *Roman* Year contained but ten Months. Among ſome Barbarous People, the Year contained but three Months: In *Greece* among the *Arcadians*, but four Months: Among the *Acarnanes*, ſix. Among the *Egyptians* a Month was a Year; and aftewards their Year contained four Months. The *Egyptians* are thought to be moſt ancient, and to compute an infinite number of Years in their Annals; the reaſon of which proceeds from their uſing Months for Years.

Alexander ab Alexandro, Book 3. c. 24. *Dier. Gen.* writing of the variety of Years uſed by the Ancients, ſays of the *Egyptians*, *Non una facie, ſed multiplici ſorte variarunt, ut quandoque trium, ſæpius quatuor menſium annum efficerent, plerumque menſis ſpatio ad curſum* Lunæ *metiebantur*: 'The 'Egyptians did not uſe one kind of Year: for 'ſometimes their Year conſiſted but of three 'Months, more often of four, and for the moſt 'part it was but a *Lunar* Month. From whence it follows, that nothing was more uncertain than their Account of time; which yet is the *baſis* of all true Hiſtory: and that in things ſo remote, we can have no ſure footing but in the *Moſaic* Hiſtory, of whoſe *Chronology* and the certainty thereof we have diſcourſed at large.

Pag.

Pag. 192. *As to the Origine of good and evil, methinks 'tis less contradictory and unreasonable to believe as the ancient* Persians *did, That there were two Beginnings of things; the one good, the other evil. For how can Evil proceed from a Being infinitely good, and without whom nothing is,* If evil be not? *And if* Genesis *be a Parable, the* Persians *may be in the right as much as the* Jews.

ANSWER.

The Origin of *Evil* hath much exercised the *Philosophers* of old; nor can we have any certainty thereof, without *Revealed Religion.* For how otherwise could we come to the right notion of sin; or a deviation from *Good* in all Men, a lapse from our first estate, wherein *God*, who is all good, created us?

How perplexed our Author is about this Question! for in this Page he affirms, 'That if 'the Book of *Genesis* be a Parable (and he sup-'poses it to be so) the *Persians* may be in the right 'as much as the *Jews.* And yet Page 205. He affirms, That this lapse of Nature, may be discovered by Natural Reason, if the opinion of the *Jews* be according to Natural Reason (as Mr. *Blount* bears us in hand) how can the Opinion of the *Persians*, which is diametrically opposite to it, be in the right? these are great inconsistencies.

If the *Persians* (laying aside the Book of *Genesis*) may be in the right, our Author's Discourse of *Natural Religion* is ridiculous: For he supposes, Page 195. the first Article of *Na-*

tural Religion to be, *That there is one GOD Infinite, Eternal, and Creatour of all things.* Whereas the *Perſians* make two *Anti-gods*, equally Infinite and Eternal, and that one of them is the Author of *Good*, and the other of *Evil.* So that the Sentiments of the *Perſians* is repugnant to the Notion of a *Deity:* For while they make two Gods, they make none at all. And conſequently he is guilty of *Idolatry* and *Atheiſm*; and the great Contradictions in the Opinion of the *Perſians* are very palpable. If this *Perſian* Principle of *Evil* be abſolutely contrary to the other Principle of *Good*, it muſt in all its Perfections be contrary to it. Now ſince all Perfections belong to that Principle which is good, as Infinity of Being, and Neceſſity of Exiſtence: it unvoidably follows, That the Principle of *Evil*, the other *Anti-god*, which is in all things contrary to the former, muſt be an Infinite *Non entity*, which yet exiſts. And if this be not the height of *Non-ſenſe*, nothing can be ſo. Beſides, this Principle overthrows all Religion, as well Natural as Revealed: it deſtroys all Vertue and Goodneſs: For if this contrary Principle be the Cauſe of all *Evil*, then *Evil* neceſſarily falls out: all Freedom of Will is deſtroy'd: all difference of *Good* and *Evil* is taken away. For if *Evil* becomes once neceſſary, it loſeth its Nature: there can be then no Government of the World by Laws, no Rewards, no Puniſhments, for they all ſuppoſe Liberty of Action. All theſe muſt be baniſhed out of the World, if this *Perſian*

Opi-

Opinion be true. Which according to Mr. *Blount* may be true, if *Geneſis* be a Parable, and in his Opinion it is ſo: To ſuch Contradictions Men expoſe themſelves, when they take on them the Patronage of ſuch groſs Lyes and Falſehoods.

How important this Queſtion is, and of how great Concernment it is to us to fix it on ſure grounds, no body can be ignorant. To which purpoſe that of *Simplicius* is remarkable, in his Commentary on *Epictetus*, περὶ τῆς ὑπερβάσεως τῶν καλῶν ὁ λόγος μὴ καλῶς διορθωθεὶς, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβείας αἴτιος γέγονε, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἠθῶν εὐαγωγίας τὰς ἀρχὰς διετάραξε, καὶ πολλαῖς καὶ ἀλύτοις ἀπορίαις ἐνέβαλε τοὺς μὴ καλῶς αἰτιολογοῦντας αὐτήν: 'The Controverſy about the 'Nature of *Good* and *Evil*, not being well ſta-'ted, is the cauſe of great Impiety towards *God*, 'and perverts the Principle of good Life, and 'caſts thoſe Perſons into innumerable perplexi-'ties, who are not able to give a rational ac-'count thereof.

If we conſult *Origen* and *Celſus*, we may ſoon perceive that the Origin of *Evil* cannot be diſcovered by *Natural Religion*: for both own the diſcovery thereof to be of great difficulty.

Celſus ſays, τὶς ἡ τῶν κακῶν φύσις, ὃ ῥᾴδιον μὲν γνῶναι τῷ μὴ φιλοσοφήσαντι: 'Tis a diffi-'cult thing to know the Nature of *Evil*, unleſs 'a Man philoſophiſes; the Vulgar are not ca-'pable of it. And altho' *Origen* differs from *Celſus*,

Celſus, lib. 4. and ſays, That *Celſus* is in an Errour in imputing this to *Matter*, yet in this accords with him, εἴπερ ἄν ἄλλος τὶς τόπος τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐξετάσεως δεόμενος, δυσθηρατὸς ἐς τὴν φύσει ἡμῶν, ἐν τούτοις καὶ ἡ τῶν κακῶν ταχθείν ἂν γένεσις: 'If any thing in the World be of diffi-'cult diſcovery, that which relates to the Ori-'gin of *Evil* is of the number of thoſe things. This is affirm'd by *Origen*, with reſpect to *Natural Religion*; in which all things are of very eaſy inveſtigation: and as Mr. *Blount* ſays, of the Innate Idea of a *Deity* (p. 178.) are ſoon imprinted on the Minds of Men.

Plutarch in his Book *de Iſide & Oſiride* (p. 369, 370, and 371.) καὶ δόκει τοῦτο τοῖς πλείστοις καὶ σοφωτάτοις. νομίζουσι γὰρ οἱ μὲν θεὸς, εἶναι δύο καθάπερ ἀντιτέχνας τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἀγαθῶν, τὸν δὲ φαύλων δημιουργὸν, &c. 'This Opinion pleaſeth 'many and wiſe Men: ſome think there are two 'Gods, of contrary Natures; one is the Author 'of all *Good*, the other of *Evil*. And *Diogenes Laertius* tells us, that this was the Opinion of the *Perſian Magi*, who were of greater Antiquity than the *Egyptians*, according to *Ariſtotle* in his firſt Book of *Philoſophy*: One of thoſe *Gods* was call'd *Oromaſdes*, the other *Pluto*, or *Arimanius*. And *Plutarch* ſays, 'That *Mithra* 'was a *Mediatour-God*, whom the *Perſians* plac'd 'between the other two. The *Chaldeans* made *Gods* of the *Planets*, two of which they made *Good*, the other two Authors of *Evil*, and the

odd

odd three to be promiſcuous, and middle trimming *Gods*, half *good* and half *evil*.

The *Greeks* imputed all *Good* to *Jupiter Olympius*, but *Evil* to *Hades*. The *Egyptians* teach that *Oſiris* was the Author of all *Good*; but that *Typho* was the Author of *Evil*. And *Plutarch* ſays farther, καὶ τοὔννομα κατηγορεῖν σημ' αὐτου Τυφῶνα καλοῦσι: 'The very Name of *Typho* is 'a ſufficient Indication of his Nature.

I ſhall not trouble my *Reader* with any more Inſtances of this Nature; becauſe how various and how different the Opinions of *Philoſophers* were, as to the Origin of *Evil*; how obſcure and confuſed they were in the Account they gave thereof, all Men know that have been any ways converſant in theſe Controverſies. And *Plutarch*'s Books *de Iſide* and *Oſiride*, and *de Procreatione Animæ e Timæo*, are undeniable and ſufficient Evidences thereof: In which Books, beſides the diverſities before mentioned, the *Reader* will ſoon find, that the great Admirers of the *Philoſophers* do not ſeem to underſtand them on this Subject: But this indeed is no wonder, ſince nothing is more plain, than that they did not underſtand themſelves. Neither could it be otherwiſe, ſince they were deſtitute of proper means requiſite hereunto.

And now I appeal to any judicious *Reader*, whether any thing can be more abſurd, more impious, more contradictory to Right Reaſon, than what Mr. *Blount* hath written concerning the Origin of *Evil*. And if the right Notion thereof could

could have been imprinted on Mens Minds by Nature, without Scripture and Revealed Religion, how is it poſſible ſo many *Philoſophers* and whole Nations ſhould have been guilty of ſuch grand Abſurdities, as we have ſeen that they were.

Pag. 193. *The Opinion of Plurality of Worlds ſeem more agreeable to* God's *infinite (for ſo muſt all* God's *Qualities be) communicative Quality, to be continually making new Worlds; ſince otherwiſe this Quality or Act of Creating would be only once exerted, and for infinite duration lie uſeleſs and dormant.*

ANSWER.

The Opinion of the Plurality of Worlds, was maintained by ſeveral of the ancient Philoſophers, as *Anaximander*, *Anaximenes*, *Democritus*, *Epicurus*, his Scholar, *Metrodorus*, and others, who maintained an infinity of Worlds: and their great Reaſon (as *Elias Cretenſis* ſays) was from the infinite Power and Goodneſs of God. On the contrary, the Stoics would not allow above one World, which they call the Univerſe: and *Plato* endeavours to prove the ſame by three Arguments, as may be ſeen in *Plutarch*, in his firſt Book, Chap. 5. of the Opinion of the Philoſophers. Of the ſame Opinion was his Scholar *Ariſtotle*, who labours to prove the ſame in no leſs then two whole Chapters; as to the Validity of his Arguments

ments I ſhall not write any thing in particular, thinking it much better to adviſe the Reader to conſult him about this Subject. This is notorious, that what he takes upon himſelf to prove, he commonly confirms by ſtrong Reaſons; and indeed, a Man ſhall ſcarce find any philoſophical Subject, but may, by ſome means or other, be collected out of his Writings.

Dr. *Pearſon* aſſures us, in his Dedication of *Laertius* to King *Charles* the Second, that Dr. *Harvey* was commonly known to have ſaid, *Nihil fere unquam in ipſis naturæ penetralibus inveniſſe ſe, quin cum Ariſtotelem ſuum penſiculatius evolveret, idem ab illo aut explicatum, aut ſaltem cognitum reperiret.* He ſcarce ever found any thing among the Myſteries of Nature, but when he had diligently peruſed the Books of *Ariſtotle*, he found the ſame, either explained, or known by him. So that I conceive, that his Authority and Reaſons to be a great Prejudice to the Opinion of the Plurality of Worlds.

'Tis reported of *Ariſtotle*, that when he read the Moſaic Writings, that he commended them for the Majeſty of the Stile, he thought it worthy of a God. The fault he found was, that the Method was Unphiloſophical, which doth not command, but perſwades a Belief in the Reader; without all Controverſie, he committed not that pretended Error in *Moſes*. And therefore I doubt not, but the Reader will

will find more ſatisfaction in his Oracles of Reaſon, for the Unity of the World, then in Mr. *Blount*'s for the plurality of Worlds.

But whatſomever liberty might be allowed Philoſophers in this point, becauſe perhaps it may not plainly contradict any Principle of Reaſon, which was the Rule they walked by. The ſame ought not to be allowed to us; for this Opinion certainly deſerves a Cenſure in all, who pretend to Chriſtianity.

The Arguments made uſe of, are very weak, the Power of *God* is infinite, his goodneſs is infinite and communicative, yet his Power and his Goodneſs does not extend themſelves beyond his Will and Pleaſure. This would make God a neceſſary Agent, and deprive him of thoſe Perfections he hath been pleaſed to beſtow on ſome of his Creatures. But that which exceeds all belief is, that Mr. *Blount*, who makes this World we live in eternal, and conſequently uncreated, and a God, ſhould yet in this place contend for a Plurality of Worlds, and that upon a pious pretence; for fear, forſooth, that the Act of Creating ſhould only be once exerted, and for an infinite Duration lie Dormant and Uſeleſs.

If this manner of Argumentation be allowed of, into what abſurdities may we fall? *Tully*, in his firſt Book, *De Finibus*, ſpeaking of the difference between *Epicurus* and *Democritus* (and that *Epicurus* corrupts and depraves what he pretends to correct in *Democritus*) obſerves, that he makes innumerable Worlds

to

to have their Original, and to periſh daily. *Innumerabiles mundi qui & oriantur & interiant quotidie.* How agreeable is this falſe and ridiculous Aſſertion with our Author's Method?

The minute Declination of Atomes without an efficient Cauſe is abſurd and unbecoming a Philoſopher: Yet 'tis agreeable to this Method; for this Declination is more according with God's Goodneſs, then a conſtant natural Deſcent of Atoms in parallel Lines. But this favour muſt not be afforded here, ſince Mr. *Blount*, by his approving *Ocellus Lucanus*, hath baniſhed, with *Epicurus* and *Deſcartes*, all final Cauſes from theſe Speculations.

Nay, if this Method be allowed, I know nothing in *Epicurus*'s Natural Philoſophy but may be defended; although *Tully* hath abundantly proved him to be as bad a Naturaliſt, as he was a Moraliſt, or a Logician.

This Opinion of the Plurality of Worlds, ſeems not to be ſo agreeable to Holy Scripture. Certainly *Moſes*'s Relation of the Creation, muſt needs be thought to be deficient, if this Opinion be true; for he menrions only one World, which comprehended all Things. This Opinion was alſo for ſome time accounted Heretical; for *Virgilius*, Biſhop of *Zalzburg*, was caſt out of his Biſhoprick, excommunicated, and condemned for a Heretick, by Pope *Zachary*, for this Opinion, as the great Annaliſt, *Baronius*, acquaints us, in the Year of our Lord, 748. What

Aven.

Aventinus and others affirm of his Deprivation and Excommunication, for holding there were Antipodes, proves a miſtake. Although I doubt not but that Aſſertion would have given great Offence; as may probably be gathered from *Lactantius*, in the third Book of his *Inſtit. chap.* 24. and from St. *Auſtin*, of the City of God, Book 16. Chap. 9. and from many others after them. As alſo from the little Skill that Pope *Zachary*, and the Popes about thoſe Days, had in the Mathematical Sciences.

I hope it may not be unpleaſing to the Reader, If I give him here a ſhort account of the Reſolution of this Queſtion by *Merſenus*, a late learned Jeſuit, and one that had the Reputation of a great Philoſopher. He thinks the Opinion of the Plurality of Worlds not to be Heretical, nor againſt the Faith; becauſe (as he ſays) it doth not contradict any expreſs place of Holy Scripture, nor the determination of the Univerſal Church. Yet he thinks it to be a very raſh Opinion, foraſmuch as it repugns the Conſent of the Fathers; whoſe Authority, notwithſtanding, he thinks to be of no ſuch Weight in Matters Philoſophical.

If the Jeſuit had plainly proved this matter to be purely Philoſophical, he had not been wide of the Mark. But the Method of *Moſes*, and his Silence in ſo great a Point, makes his Reproof to be too mild; this Opinion therefore (to

(to ſay the leaſt of it) is impious, prophane, and unbecoming a Chriſtian.

What follows in Mr. *Blount*'s Oracles, touching revealed and natural Religion, hath been often treated of in the foregoing Diſcourſe; in which I have proved the inſufficiency of natural Religion, as to the great ends of Man's Happineſs and Miſery in another World; and other things incident to that Queſtion. Wherefore, not being willing to trouble my Reader with long Repetitions, I proceed to that which follows in this Section, and relates to *Ocellus Lucanus*.

Pag. 210. *If any Man ſhould conceive the Univerſe to have been made, he would not be able to find into what it ſhould be corrupted and diſſolved; ſince that out of which it was made, was before the Univerſe, as that into which it ſhall be corrupted, was after the Univerſe.*

ANSWER.

That which made *Ocellus Lucanus*, and *Ariſtotle*, and others, to fall into this great Error, as to the World's Eternity, were two great Miſtakes, which they looked on as undoubted Principles. The one was, that out of nothing ſomething could not be produced; and that whatſoever had a beginning muſt have an end; and reciprocally, whatſoever ſhall have no end, had no beginning. Whereas theſe pretended Maxims are not grounded on general Reaſon,

but only upon particular Obſervations of ſuch things here below, which are produced by the ordinary ways of Generation and Corruption. Yet ſo difficult it is for a Man to retrieve himſelf from ſuch Obſervations, that it muſt be confeſſed, that among all the Hypotheſis of them who would deſtroy our holy Faith, none is ſo plauſible as that of the Eternity of the World. And this made *Scaliger*, in his ſixty firſt Exercitation againſt *Cardan*, Sect. 6. where he rejects the Arguments of *Philoponus* as frivolous (for ſo he calls them) to conclude —*ſola religione mihi perſuadetur mundum cœpiſſe atque finem incendio habiturum.* Nothing but revealed Religion could induce me to believe, that the World had a beginning, and that it ſhould have an end.

Pag. 210. Ocellus Lucanus *ſays, his Opinion is, that the Univerſe admitteth neither Generation nor Corruption, foraſmuch as it ever was, and ever ſhall be.*

ANSWER.

It is very evident, that our Naturaliſt proceeds (in aſſerting his Principle) of the uſual Courſe of Generation and Corruption, which is obvious to our Senſes; or on the Works of Art, which always ſuppoſe pre-exiſtent Matter; which, if we deny, all his Arguments vaniſh. And in truth, he is guilty of that Sophiſm, which the Logicians call, *Petitio Prin-*

Principii, a begging of his Principle; in taking that to be granted, which is the thing to be proved.

And whereas he ſays, if we could find out that of which the World was made, yet we cannot find into what it is diſſolved, he is under a great miſtake; for the Production of a thing hath no neceſſary Relation to the continuance or diſcontinuance of its Exiſtence, for one thing may begin to be, and laſt but an Hour, another may laſt for a thouſand Years, another may laſt for ever; yet all three (and as many as you pleaſe) may begin at one and the ſame inſtant, the difference depending either on the Nature of the things themſelves, or on the Pleaſure and Will of God who made them.

We acknowledge, and firmly believe, that the Univerſe was made by God; yet with the ſame firmneſs we believe, that part of this Univerſe ſhall periſh, part continue to all Eternity, as Angels, and the Souls of Men; by which it appears, that ſome things which had a beginning ſhall have no end, and ſome ſhall have an end. So that *Lucanus*'s pretended Univerſal Rule is not only precarious, but alſo falſe.

P. 211. *Now whatſoever had a beginning of its Production, and ought to partake of Diſſolution, admiteth two Alterations; the one from that which is leſs to that which is greater; and from that which is worſe, to that which is better: and that Term*

from whence it beginneth to be altered, is called Production, as that to which it arriveth is called State; the other alteration is from that which is greater to that which is leſs, and from that which is better to that which is worſe; but the Period of this Alteration is called Corruption and Diſſolution. Now the Univerſe doth of it ſelf afford us no ſuch Evidence, ſince no one ever ſaw it produced nor altered, either in Aſcenſu *or* Deſcenſu, *but it always remained in the ſame condition it is now in, equal, and like it ſelf.*

ANSWER.

Mr. *Blount*'s Tranſlation of *Ocellus Lucanus* is not ſo fair as it ought to be; for the Greek Word, γένεσις, as it is in the Original, ought to be tranſlated, *Generation*, and not *Production*, which ſomewhat alters the caſe, the one being more general then the other; which yet I ſhould have taken no notice of, did it not ſeem affected and deſigned. But perhaps he followed the Tranſlation of *Ludovicus Nogarola*, the Italian, none of the beſt Interpreters. However, this Argument of *Ocellus* is more groſs then the former; for he who manageth the Argument this way, proves nothing at all, ſave only this (which no Man in his right Wits will deny) that this Univerſe, and the Parts thereof, which are of greater Perfection, were not generated in that manner

ner that we ſee ſome other Parts thereof were, as Trees, Plants, and living Creatures.

But that there can be no other way of Production beſides theſe ordinary Generations, or that the Univerſe was not ſome other way actually produced, neither this Argument, nor any other of his Arguments prove. And he ſtill labours under the Imputation of that Sophiſm, of begging the Queſtion. If he had proved that, it implies a Contradiction, for Almighty God to have produced the Univerſe after any other manner, then thoſe things are produced, which we ſee and obſerve in this World, he had proved ſomething to the purpoſe.

We aſſert one infinite and eternal Being, who produced all things out of nothing, and preſerves them in their Beings; and this we call not Generation, but Creation; which is a Production excluding all Concurrence of any material Cauſe, and all Dependence of any kind of Subject, as preſuppoſing no Privation, nor including any Motion. So that the proper and peculiar Senſe of the Word, *Creation*, is expreſſed, when we conceive ſomething that is made, and not any thing preceeding out of which it was made. It muſt be granted, that the Word uſed by *Moſes* in the beginning of *Geneſis*, requires not ſuch a peculiar acception, for it is often uſed to ſignifie any kind of Production, as the making of one Subſtance out of another pre-exiſting;

as alſo, for the renovating or reſtoring any thing to its former Perfection, for want of Hebrew Words in Compoſition; nay, it ſometimes imports doing ſome new and wonderful Work, the producing ſome ſtrange and admirable Effect. We do not therefore collect the true Nature of Creation from the Force of any Word.

(The Words, *Creation* and *Annihilation*, in the Modern Senſe, are not uſed, either with the Jews, the Greeks or the Latins, they are factitious Words, neither that I know of are they ſo uſed in any Tongue whatſoever), but we collect it from the Teſtimony of God's Word. The Opinion of the Church of the Jews, will ſufficiently appear in that zealous Mother to her ſeventh and youngeſt Son, 2d. *Maccabees*, Chap. 7. Ver. 28. *I beſeech thee my Son, look upon the Heaven and Earth, and all that is therein, and conſider that God made them of things that are not.* Which is a clear Deſcription of Creation, that is, Production out of nothing. But becauſe this is not Canonical Scripture, we ſhall therefore evince it by the undoubted Teſtimony of St. *Paul*, who expreſſing the Nature of *Abraham*'s Faith, propoundeth him whom he believed, as God who quickneth the Dead, and calleth thoſe things which be not, as if they were.

For,

For, as to be called in the Language of the Scripture, is to be (*behold what manner of Love the Father hath beſtowed on us, that we ſhould be called the Sons of God*, ſaith St. *John*, in his firſt Epiſtle; who in his Goſpel told us, *He hath given us Power to become the Sons of God*): ſo to call, is to make, or cauſe to be; as where the Prophet *Jeremy* ſaith, *Thou haſt cauſed all this Evil to come upon them*, the Original may be thought to ſpeak no more then this, *Thou haſt called this Evil to them*; he therefore calleth thoſe things that be not, as if they were, who maketh thoſe things which were not, to be, and produceth that which hath a Being, out of that which had not, that is, out of nothing. This Reaſon generally perſuaſive unto Faith, is more peculiarly applied by the Apoſtle, to the belief of a Creation; For, *through Faith*, ſaith he, Heb. 11. ver. 3. *we underſtand that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God*; ſo that things which are ſeen, were not made of things which do appear: For the μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων, in this place, is equivalent to the ἐξ ὐκ ὄντων, in the Book of *Maccabees*; and this manner of Speech is according to the beſt Greek Authors, as our Doctor *Pearſon* hath obſerved. The Senſe of the Apoſtle then is, that thoſe things which are ſeen; that is, that are, were made of thoſe things which did not appear, that is, which were not.

There is an excellent Treatiſe among the Works of *Juſtin Martyr*, entituled (*Everſio dogmatum Ariſtotelis*) a Refutation of *Ariſtotle*'s Opinions, directed to one *Paul*, a Presbyter of great Note, as it ſeems from the Compellation given him, ὦ τιμιώτατε πρεσβύτερε Παῦλε. O moſt honourable Presbyter *Paul*. Who the Author of this Treatiſe was, is not agreed among the Criticks. He ſeems to be an Author of ſome Antiquity, for *Bellarmine* (*De Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis*, *p.* 72.) in his Book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, gives this account of this Queſtion; *De reprehenſione dogmatum Ariſtotelis meminit Photius in Bibliotheca, neque extat evidens judicium falſitatis, ideo nihil habeo quod dicam.* *Photius*, in his Bibliotheca, makes mention of the Book entituled, *A Refutation of the Opinions of* Ariſtotle, of which there is no Proof of its being ſuppoſititious; wherefore I will determine nothing thereof. Which Author having written ſomething very material to our preſent purpoſe, I have thought fit not to paſs it over in ſilence.

The deſign of the Treatiſe, as he tells *Paul* the Presbyter, was to gratifie him, in writing ſome Collections and Annotations of the Opinions of the Greek Philoſophers concerning God and his Creatures. Not, as he ſaith, that *Paul* ſhould learn any truth from them, but to make it plain to him, that the Proofs of thoſe Philoſophers were not grounded

ed on Science and Demonstration, as they vainly boasted, but on uncertain Conjectures.

According to those, who have received their Doctrines from God, and know the difference between the Creator and the Creature; there is only one God unbegotten, according to any Notion of that Word; who had no God, nor Gods, before him, nor any Coeternal with him, who had no Subject on which to Operate, nor any to repugn or oppose his Pleasure; having an incorruptible Nature and Essence, and no Impediment in his manner of operating, συναίδιον οὐκ ἐχων οὔτε ὑποκείμενον, οὔτε ἀντικείμενον, δημιουργὸς ὢν τοῦ κόσμου παντός: He hath nothing coeval with him, he needs no Materials to work on, no Adversary to withstand him. And then having laid down *Aristotle*'s Opinion, as to the necessary Existence of Matter out of his first Book of natural Auscultations, thus reasons against him; Ἐι οὕτως ἐςιν ἡ ὕλη ἀγένητος ὡς ὁ θεός.

If Matter be as necessarily existent, and as unbegotten as God himself; and if God out of this eternal Matter can make any thing, 'tis manifest that the same God can make something out of nothing; for the same Contradiction (if there be any) will be as much in the on eas the other.

This

This Obſervation is of great Value, and pulls up by the very Root, all the Hypotheſis of *Ariſtotle*, *Occllus Lucanus*, and all other Abettors and Fautors of this wicked Aſſertion of the World's Eternity.

For if Matter have its Original from it ſelf, how can it be ſubject to the Power of another? Whatſoever hath infinite Power in it ſelf, hath a Power upon ſomething beyond it ſelf; but if God and Matter have it both, they can never have a Power upon each other, or without themſelves.

Beſides, if God's Power be infinite, it cannot be confined to Matter, for then we conceive the Bounds of infinite Power; which is a greater Abſurdity, then to aſſert a Power which is able to produce ſomething out of nothing. It is commonly ſaid in the Schools, that *modus operandi ſequitur modum eſſendi*, ſuch as the thing is, ſuch are its Operations. And this I conceive to be an Axiom received by all Men. For if ſome real and Material Being muſt be preſuppoſed by indiſpenſable Neceſſity, without which, God could not cauſe any thing to be; then God is not independent in his Actions, nor of infinite Power, and abſolute Activity; which is contradictory to the Divine Perfection. Vain therefore is this Oracle of our Author's, of the World's Eternity; or which is all one, the Opinion of a real Matter coæval with God.

Pag.

Pag. 216. *Now it is very much, that this Author,* Ocellus Lucanus *(who for his Antiquity, is held almoſt a Cotemporary with* Moſes, *if not before him) ſhould have ſo different a Sentiment of the World's Beginning, from that which* Moſes *had; methinks if* Moſes's *Hiſtory of the Creation, and of* Adam's *being the firſt Man, had been a general received Opinion at that time,* Ocellus Lucanus, *who was ſo ancient, and ſo eminent a Philoſopher, ſhould not have been altogether ignorant thereof.*

ANSWER.

What *Origen* obſerves of *Celſus*, *lib.* 4. that χριστιανοῖς ἐγκαλῶν ἀμαθίαν καὶ ἀπαιδευσίαν, &c. 'That he objected Ignorance and 'Illiterature to *Chriſtians*, whereas he him-'ſelf was a great *Ignoramus* in Hiſtory, in mak-'ing *Heſiod* ancienter than *Moſes*, who was much ancienter than the *Trojan* War. The ſame I have obſerved of Mr. *Blount*, who in his *Oracles* hath objected the ſame to a Learned *Clergy*; and yet is far more abſurd in his *Chronology*, relating to *Ocellus Lucanus*, than *Celſus* was in the caſe of *Heſiod*. *Hornius*, in his *Hiſtoria Philoſophica*, *lib.* 3. *c.* 11. makes *Ocellus* one of *Pythagoras* his Scholars, *Ex ejus diſcipulis qui ante* Platonem *floruerunt*, Architas, Philolaus, Ocellus Lucanus: Among his Scholars, who were before *Plato*, are *Architas*, *Philolaus*, *Parmenides*. Mr. *Sel-*

den

den in his Book *de Jure Naturæ & Gentium, lib. 5. c. 11. Ex* Pythagoreorum *Schola vetuſtiſſimus Autor* Ocellus Lucanus: 'In the 'School of the *Pythagoreans* was that moſt 'ancient Author *Ocellus Lucanus.* And to the ſame purpoſe, our moſt Famous Men, Biſhop *Pearſon*, and Biſhop *Stillingfleet.* The eldeſt account I can find of Him in *Diogenes Laertius*, is in the Life of *Archytas Tarentinus*; who in his Epiſtle to *Plato*, ſays, That when he came to *Lucania*, he met with ſome of the Poſterity of *Ocellus*; and that what Commentaries he had met with of Empire, Laws, Sanctity, and the Generation of all things, he ſent to him.

This then is the greateſt Antiquity that can be pretended for *Ocellus*, which if granted to be true, yet he comes ſeveral Centuries ſhort of *Moſes.*

Yet, with all due ſubmiſſion to ſo great Authority, I have ſome reaſon to think this may be a miſtake; for the Writings of *Ocellus* ſavour nothing of *Pythagoriſm:* He Philoſophizes without regard of numbers, and after the manner of the *Peripateticks*, he uſeth the word *Antiperiſtaſis*, which is not to be found in any of the Ancient Philoſophers, no not in *Plato*; and ſome accurate Perſons aſſure us, that *Ariſtotle* was the Inventor thereof: Neither can I think, what *Scaliger* (in his 28. *Exercit.*) affirms concerning *Plato*'s *Antiperiſtaſis*, can invalidate this Preſumption.

As

As to the *Dialect* in which it was first written, I can affirm nothing for certain: it is extant both in the *Attic* and *Doric*; in the latter those of the *Italic* Family always writ, as *Architas Tarentinus*, *Timæus Locrus*, and others: and 'tis Suspicious, that this Book was first written in the polite *Attic*, and afterward to conciliate some Authority, it was changed into the obsolete *Doric*. But I leave this to the *Criticks*, and make use of better Arguments: altho' I cannot deny but that this Method is frequently made use of by *Gerhard Vossius*; and particularly in the 12. and 13. chap. of his Book *de Philosophia*, in the case of that great Physician *Aretæus* the *Cappadocian*.

Plutarch lib. 2. of the Opinion of Philosophers, says, πυθαγόραν καὶ πλατῶνα γενητὸν ὑπὸ θεῦ τὲν κόσμον καὶ φθαρτὸν μὲν ὅσον ἐπὶ φύσι: That the World was made by *God*, and if we respect its Nature, it was corruptible. And if we consult *Timæus Locrus*, or any other of the *Pythagoric* School, we shall find their Sentiments very different from those of *Ocellus*: And in a word, 'tis very strange he should dissent from his Master in a point of so considerable moment.

Aristotle lib. 1. *de Cœlo*, *c.* 11. γενόμενον μὲν ὖν κόσμον ἅπαντες εἶναι φάσι: All Philosophers say the World was made, and not eternal: And to the same effect he speaks *lib.* 3. *c.* 2. Now altho' we may suppose that *Aristotle*

Stole was ſo diſingenuous as not to own, that he had his Arguments from *Ocellus* ('tis certain he no where mentions him) yet it overcomes all belief, that he ſhould be ſo impudent as to affirm, as he did, that all Philoſophers before him held the World to have had a beginning, if this Book of *Ocellus Lucanus* had been extant in his days, as it is now, eſpecially had it been of that Eminence and Antiquity as Mr. *Blount* pretends, who hath diſcourſed ſubtilly, but very injudiciouſly of ſo weighty a Subject.

Page 218. *It plainly appears out of the* Bible, *that there were two Creations, both of Man and Woman*; *and that* Adam *was not the firſt Man, nor* Eve *the firſt Woman, only the firſt of the Holy Race, and this divers of the* Jews *believe. For in the firſt Chapter of* Geneſis, *ver.* 27. *it is ſaid*,—So *God* created Man in his own image, in the image of *God* created He him: Male and Female created He them: *Bidding them increaſe and multiply, and have dominion over all things. Which plainly ſhews that Man was then created, and that the other Creation of* Adam *and* Eve, *ſpoken of in the ſecond Chapter, ver.* 2. *and* 22. *were of the firſt Man and Woman of the Holy Race, and not the firſt Man and Woman that ever was in the World.*

AN-

ANSWER.

This ſeems to me to be the greateſt *Paradox*, that I have at any time met with.

Vincentius Lirinenſis (*cap.* 17.) accuſes *Neſtorius*, That, *inaudito ſcelere duos vult eſſe Filios Dei, duos Chriſtos*——with an unheard of wickedneſs he affirmed, That there were two *Chriſts*, two *Sons of God*: one who was begotten of his Father, the other of his Mother. Wherefore the Virgin *Mary* ought not to be call'd the Mother of *God*, but of *Chriſt*: becauſe that *Chriſt*, who was *God*, was not born of the *Virgin*, but He only who was *Chriſt*.

Buxdorf in his *Synagoga Judaica* (*cap.* 36.) affirms, That the Modern *Jews* believe that there are to be two *Meſſiah's*: *Duos ſibi* Meſſias *fingunt*, *vel ſomniant*, *alterum* Meſſiam Ben Joſeph, *alterum vero* Meſſiam Ben David: They perſwaded themſelves, that one of their *Meſſias's* was to be the Son of *Joſeph*, the other the Son of *David*: That one was to be of the Tribe of *Ephraim*, a poor ſimple Man; the other to be of the Tribe of *Judah*, a King and a Conquerour.

Tertullian (*lib.* 4. *cont. Marcion*, *c.* 6.) gives us this Account, *Conſtituit* Marcion *alium eſſe* Chriſtum, *qui* Tiberianis *temporibus*: Marcion held that there were to be two *Chriſts*; one who was revealed in the time of *Tiberius*, by an unknown *God*, for the Salvation of the

Gen-

Gentiles; the other was to be ſent from the Creatour, for the reſtitution of the *Jewiſh* ſtate.

A Man might think that there was ſome miſchief in this number *Two*; and that the Philoſophers who curſt it, had good grounds for ſo doing. Yet among all the *Two's*, I find none to be more abſurd and more ungrounded than this of the *Two Creations*: For it is deſtitute of the leaſt colour of Reaſon. I think it not unreaſonable to query, from which of the two *Creations* our *Deiſts* deſcend? They will not pretend to deſcend from *Adam*, for the *Holy Race* deſcended from him: Neither do I know how they could deſcend from the Firſt Creation, or from the Man and Woman before *Adam* and *Eve*, if the *Moſaic* Hiſtory of the *Creation* be a meer Allegory.

This is a Knot to be unty'd by Friend *Toriſmond*, or Ingenious Major *A*. For my part I know no way, but to cut it: And that our *Deiſts* may be ſaid (like *Curtius Rufus* in *Tacitus*) *ex ſe naſci*, to be deſcended from Themſelves.

If the Book of *Geneſis* be a meer Parable and an Allegory, as our Author bears us in hand that it is, his Argument falls to the ground: But as we are of another Opinion, ſo we ſhall anſwer his Argument upon a truer Principle.

Mr. *Blount* here follows the Author of the *Preadamites*, who makes a double *Creation*; the

the one in the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*, the other in the ſecond Chapter; and that the firſt may relate to the firſt Peopling of the World; but the ſecond relates to the firſt Man and Woman of the *Jewiſh* Nation.

Whoſoever conſults *Moſes* will find it otherwiſe. The utmoſt that can be collected is, That in the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*, the creation of Male and Female is laid down in general, ver 27. but in the ſecond Chapter it is laid down in particular, as ver. 7. *The Lord God formed man of the duſt of the ground*; and ver. 22. That *the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, he made a woman.*

This is a matter of great Conſequence; becauſe if there were Men and Women before *Adam*, I cannot perceive how the Scripture can be true. I will therefore demonſtrate firſt out of the *Moſaic* Writings, and ſecondly out of other places of Scripture, that this a meer Fiction. *Moſes* in his ſecond Cap. v. 3. ſays, That *God bleſſed the ſeventh day, and ſanctified it*, becauſe that in it He had reſted from all his works which God had created and made; can it then be imagined that *Moſes* ſhould write thus, if the firſt Parents of the Jewiſh Nation were not then created? Can it be imagined he ſhould thus contradict himſelf in the next words? certainly no Man in his right wits can think ſo.

Geneſis the 3. ver. 20. we read, that *Adam* called his Wife's Name *Eve*, becauſe ſhe was

he Mother of all Living, that is, of all Men; as Mr. *Selden* well obſerves in his 1. Book *De jure nat. & gent.* ch. 5. whoſe words being very pertinent, I ſhall here recite them. *Nam etiam in* Geneſi *capite tertio verſu viceſimo, omne vivens.* Onkelos Chaldæus *expreſsim, Mater omnium filiorum hominum. Cui conſona eſt illa* Judæorum Mauritanienſium, *Mater omnium viventium quæ rationalia ſunt. Et* Arabica *illa altera* Saudiæ, *ubi adjicitur quæ rationalia & mortalia ſunt, etiam in* Tawaſii Perſica *ibi vertitur, Mater omnium viventium quæ rationalia:* 'For alſo in the third Chapter of *Ge-* 'neſis ver. 20. all living ſignifies every Man; 'as where *Eve* is called the Mother of all 'Living. The *Chaldean Onkelos* renders it, 'The Mother of all the Sons of Men. The 'Verſion of the *Mauritanian* Jews, The Mo- 'ther of all living Creatures who are rational. 'The *Arabic* of *Saudia*, adds a word, and 'reads, Rational and Mortal. The *Perſian* 'Verſion of *Tawus* renders it in like manner, 'The Mother of all thoſe living Creatures 'who are rational.

To this concurrent Conſent, we are neceſſitated to add this Remark, *viz.* That if the *Hypotheſis* of the *Preadamites* be true, *Adam* had been very ridiculous, in calling *Eve* the Mother of all living; when ſhe was (according to them) but the Mother of the Jewiſh Nation. And *Moſes* had been very incongruous in his Hiſtory, which I ſuppoſe no good Man will ſay or think. If

If we consult other Scriptures, how effectual to this purpose is that of the first Epist. to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 15. *The first man* Adam *was made a living Soul:* To what end (I pray) should the Apostle write this, but to denote that he was the Root and Original of all Mankind. As also that the first Man is of the Earth, earthy, which is a formal declaration of that of the second of *Exodus*, *He was formed of the dust of the earth.*

In the 17. Chapter of the *Acts* ver. 26. 'tis said that God hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men, for to dwell on the face of the Earth. How inconsistent is this with a double Creation, and the proceeding of the Jewish Nation alone from the latter? I know it is pretended that some *Gr.* Copies read ἐξ ενὸς without αἵματος. And *Erasmus* (who loves sometimes to be singular) says, *Verum haud scio, an perperam a librariis hæc Scriptura:* 'Truly I do not know whether this 'place of Scripture may not be changed by 'the Copiers. But here it is with *an haud scio: Erasmus* cannot tell us on his word; and Suspicions signify nothing

I am sure St. *Chrysostom* Homil. 38. on the *Acts* of the Apostles, reads according to our vulgar Copies, ὅτι πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος ἐποίησε. And *Grotius* on this place in the Criticks, seems fully to express the Sense, when he writes, That God made all Men *Ex semine unius* Adami, *ut eo quoque modo,*

cognationis naturali vinculo colligaret: 'God made all Men out of the Seed of one *Adam*, 'and bound them as it were with one Natu-'ral bond of Conſanguinity. And in truth αἷμα, or Blood, is taken in this place for the Stock or Lineage, out of which Men came. And ſo it is frequently taken in *Greek* and *Latin* Authors. *Homer* in the fourth Book of his *Odyſſes*,

Αἵματος εἷς ἀγαθοῖο φίλον τέκος :

'My dear Son, thou art well deſcended.

And *Theocritus*, in his *Heracliſcus*,

Περσήιον αἷμα:

'Thou art of the Stock of *Perſeus*.

Among the *Latins*, we have *Virgil*, *Æneid* 6.

Projice tela manu ſanguis meus:

'Caſt thy darts, my Son.

And *Tibullus ad Matrem de Filia*, *Quicquid agit ſanguis eſt tamen illa tuus:* 'Let her do 'what ſhe will, ſhe will be ſtill your Daugh-'ter. And not only among the Poets, but alſo among the Oratours too: As *Quintilian* in his Declamation *pro Milite*, *Abdicandus & ejurandus eſt non ſanguis tuus:* 'You may 'abdicate and abjure him if you pleaſe, he is 'neither your Son, nor your Relation.

What

What Mr. *Blount* affirms concerning the *Jews*, That divers of them are of this Opinion, amounts not to much; for all Men know how illiterate, and how monſtrous the *Rabbins* have been in their Opinions, ſince our Saviour's time. *Origen* in his 2d. Book againſt *Celſus*, ſays ,πάντα μὲν τὰ Ἰουδαίων τῶν νῦν μύθοι καὶ λῆροι: 'We have nothing 'now from the *Jews*, but Trifles and Fables. *Morinus* in his third part, and 7th. *Exercit.* gives this Cenſure of them, *Nihil eſt tam abſurdum, tam comicum, tam ridiculum, tam monſtroſum, atque ab omni fide, & probilitate abhorrens, ad quod probandum ſtatim præſto non ſit illis e ſacra Scriptura teſtimonium:* 'There 'is nothing ſo abſurd, ſo comical, ſo ridicu-'lous, ſo monſtrous, ſo abhorrent from all 'faith and likelihood, which they are not 'ready to prove, out of ſome place of Holy 'Writ. This ſeems to be a Deſcription of our *Deiſts* and *Pre-adamites*, in their abuſe of the Scriptures: however it demonſtrates the little advantage Mr. *Blount* can promiſe himſelf, from the countenance they give to his Opinion.

Capellus in his *Arcanum Punctuationis*, Book 2. c. 3. Judæi *in propria hiſtoria peregrini, antiquitatum ſuarum prorſus ignari:* 'The Jews 'are ſtrangers in their own Hiſtories, are ig-'norant of their own Antiquities. And certainly this Character is juſtly applicable to all ſuch of them, as collect from the Wr t-

ings of *Moſes*, That there were two Creations; and that *Adam* was not the firſt Man.

Scaliger, in his ſixth Book of the Emendation of times, acquaints us, *Manifeſta eſt* Judæorum *inſcitia, & multa quæ ad eorum ſacra et hiſtoriam pertinent, longe melius nos teneamus quam illi*: 'The ignorance of the Jews is 'very manifeſt, and we Chriſtians know 'their Sacred Rites, and their Hiſtories much 'better than they themſelves. Theſe are Teſtimonies which I have borrow'd from Learned Men, who were very converſant in all the Jewiſh Learning. And yet after all, we have reaſon to believe this is a miſtake in Mr. *Blount:* For the 4th. Article of the Jewiſh Faith (believed by all Jews without contradiction, as *L. Modena* tells us in his Hiſt. p. 245.) is, That *God* was from all eternity; and that all other other things beſides had a beginning at ſome time. And Article 9th. That *Moſes* was wholly dictated by *God*, and put not one ſyllable in of himſelf. Which as they plainly repugn the Opinion of *Ocellus Lucanus*, ſo I think it not very reconciliable with the Conſequences of *Pre-adamitiſm*, which open ſo wide a door to *Atheiſm*. The words of the moſt Learned Biſhop *Stillingfleet* (in his *Origines Sacræ*, p. 537.) are worthy of conſideration: *Whoſoever*, ſays he, *ſeriouſly conſiders the frequent Reflections on the Authority of the Scriptures, which were caſt by the Au-*

thor

thor of that Fiction, and his endeavouring on all occaſions to derogate from the Miracles recorded in it, may eaſily ſuſpect the Deſign of that Author, That his Opinion in time would undermine the Scriptures themſelves.

This ſeems to be the Character of Mr. *Blount*; for his Method is the ſame. How wickedly p. 25 and 26. doth he feign a Dialogue between *Eve* and the *Serpent?* With what levity p. 44. doth he write of the *Taylor*'s Trade, and the *Thread-maker*'s Art, which he makes uſe of to diſparage the *Moſaic* Hiſtory? With what Blaſphemy doth he diſcourſe of our *Lord*, p. 162. where he writes, that ſome mean Perſons called Him the Son of *David*; and the Mobb by that Title did cry, *Hoſanah* to him, when he made his Cavalcade upon an *Aſinego?* How unbecomingly doth he ſpeak of our *Lord* and *Moſes*; when p. 121 he makes them together with the Impoſtor *Mahomet*, to be *Politicians?* And how like the Author of *Preadamitiſm*, he derogates from Divine Miracles, the beginning of his Book ſufficiently proves: where he uſes all his Art to ſubvert theſe Divine Demonſtrations; and well knowing that his main ſtrength lies in thoſe Difficulties, he places them in the Front, that he may poiſon his *Reader*'s Mind firſt of all, and ſo prepare it for Reception of the following *Heterodoxies*. Wherefore we have con-

ſidered this at large in the firſt Section of *Geneſis*, and Divine Miracles.

Pag. 224. Diodorus Seculus *was famed for his great Learning, Reading, Enquiring; ſpeaking of the Chaldeans, he relates,* 'That they thought very long ago, that the World, according to its own Nature, was eternal, having no Beginning, nor that it ſhould have Corruption, in order to an End. *And p.* 225. Before the Expedition of *Alexander*, they reckoned Four hundred and ſeventy thouſand Years. *Likewiſe* Cicero, (*who was cotemporary with* Diodorus) *mentions the very ſame Account of Time, and Number of Years.*

ANSWER.

The Opinion of the Chaldeans, as to the Original of the World, is laid down by *Diodorus Siculus*, Book the ſecond, in theſe Words; Ὁι χαλδοῖοι τὴν μὲν τοῦ κόκμου, φύσιν ἄϊδιον, φάσιν εἶναι, καὶ μήτε ἐξ ἀρχῆς γένεσιν ἐσχηκέναι, μηθὺν ςερον φθοςὰν ἐπιδέξεσθαι, τὴν δὲ τῶν ὅλων τάξιν τὲ καὶ διακόσμησιν θεὶα τινὶ προνάια γεγονέναι, καὶ νῦν ἕκαςὰ τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ γινομένων οὐκ ὡς ἔτυχεν οὐδ' αὐτομάτως, ἀλλα' ὡρισμένη τινὶ καὶ βεδαίως κεκυρωμένη θεῶν κρίσει συντελεῖσθαι. The Chaldeans (ſays *Diodorus*) affirm the World to be eternal, that it had no Beginning of its Production, nei-

neither hereafter ſhall it have any Corruption. But the Order and Beauty of the Univerſe muſt be acknowledged to proceed from Divine Providence; and all the glorious things which we ſee in Heaven, owe not their Glory to Chance and Accident, but to the firm and unalterable Determinations of the Gods.

Of what Neceſſity Revealed Religion is, and of what Benefit to Mankind, and under what great Errors men labour who are deſtitute of it, this Inſtance of the Chaldeans fully evinces.

The Reader cannot but obſerve the Art of our *Deiſt*, in relating the Opinion of the Chaldeans; for he hath wholly concealed what they ſay of Divine Providence, that being not for his deſign. As alſo, their great difference from his beloved *Ocellus Lucanus*. The Chaldeans make the World only eternal as to the Matter of it, the Form they own to be from Providence; whereas *Ocellus* makes it eternal, not only with reſpect to its Matter, but alſo with reſpect to its Form.

What he writes as to their Computation of Four hundred and ſeventy thouſand Years before *Alexander*, amounts to nothing; unleſs he had proved by what kind of Years they computed, as we have done in the Moſaic Computation, which we have proved to be Solar.

Di-

Diodorus obſerves, that the Chaldeans, in things pertaining to their Arts, made uſe of Lunar Years of Thirty Days, which will make this monſtrous Account ſhrink conſiderably.

The Chaldeans make ſome of their firſt Kings to Reign above Forty thouſand Years, which is ſo incredible, that *Anianus* and *Panodorus* interpret thoſe Chaldean Years to be but Days.

That which will for ever cramp theſe vain Pretences of the Chaldeans, is that we have from *Simplicius*, on *Ariſtotle*'s ſecond Book *de Cælo*, where he tells us, that *Ariſtotle* deſired of *Calliſthenes*, that he would certifie him of the Chaldean Obſervations, which *Calliſthenes* did, and gives an Account not exceeding Two thouſand Years. *Calliſthenes* was a grave Perſon, not to be impoſed on by the vain Brags of the Chaldeans; he would believe nothing that they could not make to appear out of good Monuments of Antiquity.

This Argument will admit of no Solution; the Authority of one ſingle Manuſcript to the contrary, mentioned by Sir *Henry Savil*, in his ſecond Lecture on *Euclid*, is not to be oppoſed to all the vulgar Codes.

What our Author ſays concerning *Cicero*'s mentioning the ſame Account of Time and Number of Years, proves nothing but this, That Mr. *Blount* is a Man of unparallell'd Bold-

Boldneſs, and abuſes good Authors. 'Tis true, that *Cicero* mentions this monſtrous Account of the Chaldeans in two places, in his firſt and ſecond Books of Divination; but then he explodes the ſame as falſe and ridiculous. 'Tis to be noted, that Mr. *Blount* cites *Cicero* in general, and refers to no Book; he well knowing that all his Readers were not converſant in *Cicero*; and that if he had mentioned the place where this was remarked, the Reader would have cried ſhame on his Diſingenuity Both theſe places being to the ſame purpoſe, I will relate only that in the firſt Book, where *Cicero* writing of the Babylonians (who are the ſame with the Chaldeans) hath theſe Words; *Condemnemus hos aut ſtultitiæ, aut vanitatis, aut imprudentiæ qui quadringenta & ſeptuaginta millia annorum ut ipſi dicunt, monnmentis comprehenſa continent, & mentiri judicemus*— We cannot but cnndemn the Chaldeans of Folly, Vanity, and Imprudence, who boaſt that they have Antiquities of 470000 Years; and in our Judgment they are guilty of Falſhood.

AN

AN Appendix To the ANSWER.

I Have ſome reaſon to fear, that the Reader of this Diſcourſe may think, that I have been too brief in my Preface; wherefore I have thought fit to annex this Appendix.

I have already acquainted the Reader, that I have pretermitted the Examination of ſome things in theſe *ORACLES OF REASON*; viz. Things purely Philoſophical, and which may be problematically diſputed on either ſide.

What

What those other things are which I have pretermitted, I think it reasonable to acquaint my Reader with, least he may conjecture that I have passed over some Material Difficulties; I shall therefore give in this Appendix a particular Account.

I have not examined, nor any ways concerned my self, with those things that are purely Political; as when our *Deist*, in the Letter directed to Sir *W. L. &c.* to be left in the Speaker's Chamber (*p.* 169.) calls the Regulators of Corporations, and the Surrenderers of Charters, Impudent, if without Blushing, they call themselvrs Protestants: As also, when (*p.* 174.) he says, 'If the 'Church of *England* can be supported by 'such ill Men, the Lord have Mercy on her: And (*p.* 174) 'Of how great Importance 'an Honest, Impartial, and duly Elected 'House of Commons is to this Nation, every 'body knows, and the ill Effects of the con'trary, I think, is unknown to no body: 'my old Lord *Burleigh* used to say, we can 'never be throughly ruined but by a Parlia'ment— And in the same Page he writes, 'I confess, I cannot but couple these Regu'lators and Surrenderers together, with 'those Judges, and other Gentlemen of the 'long Robe, who were for the Annihilating 'or Dispencing Power— I have not concerned my self with these Political Matters; because I have not been conversant in that

ſort of Learning, and becauſe they are without my Sphear, and propoſed Deſign.

Neither have I concerned my ſelf in diſcovering thoſe Errors which are obvious to every Man; *viz.* His illogical Inferences; or his great Confidence in abuſing good Authors.

We have an Example of the firſt (*p.* 195.) where, when he is to prove the Minor of his firſt Syllogiſm, *viz.* That no Rule of Revealed Religion, ever was, or could be made known to all Men, he only proves that the large Continent of *America* was not diſcovered till within theſe Two hundred Years, a Matter of Fact incontrovertible. Whereas, unleſs he had proved that Revealed Religion never was, nor never could be diſcovered to *America*, he hath not proved his Minor.

In like manner, when (*p.* 224.) he is to prove that there were divers other Authors who wrote before *Moſes*; he thinks it ſufficient to follow an Annotator on Dr. *Browne*, who cites a Paſſage out of *Apuleius*, (whom the Pagans oppoſed to our Lord, as they did *Apollonius*) which proves nothing, but that there were ſome Men before *Moſes*: But as for Writings, we find not one Syllable in that place of *Apuleius*; which was the thing to be proved. As alſo, when (*p.* 219.) he was obliged by the Procedure of the Subject

ject insisted on, to compare the Jews with the Egyptians, Chaldees, and Phænicians, in point of Antiquity; or to compare the Writings of those respective Nations with each other; he changeth the Terms of the Comparison, and compares the Nation of the Jews with the Writings of the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phænicians: This is that which *Aristotle* justly condemns in Argumentations and Comparisons, and calls it the passing from one Genus to another.

If this Method had been used and allowed of in the well known Controversie between the Scythians and the Egyptians, the Scythians would have been vanquished, and the generally received Opinion of the Scythians Antiquity would upon no good Grounds, have been banished out of the World.

I have taken no notice of these, or of such like weak Sophisms in the foregoing Discourse; because they are in themselves very Childish, and are easily to be observed by a considering Reader.

I have also pretermitted his palpable abusing good Authors, if the Abuse be very obvious; an Example of which I shall here produce.

Pag.

[Pag. 219. He thus writes; *What* Joſephus *ſpeaks of the Greeks, and other Nations, may with the ſame reaſon be applied to* Moſes *and the Jews*, viz. *That all Founders and Eſtabliſhers of new Eſtates, have each of them ſuppoſed in their own behalf, that whoſoever was of theirs, he was the firſt of the World*, Contra Apionem, *lib.* 1.

Now howover Joſephus *boaſts ſo much of the Antiquity of his Country-men the Jews, yet he himſelf confeſſes, that he, nevertheleſs, durſt not preſume to compare the Nation of the Jews, with the Antiquity of the moſt Ancient and Infallible Writings of the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phœnicians, who dwell in ſuch Countries as are not ſubject to the Corruption of Air; and are carefully provided, that whatſoever has been done by them, ſhould not ſleep in Obſcurity, but be kept in Memory in the publick Writings of the moſt learned Men*, Contra Apionem, lib. 1.

And Pag. 220. *Which is as if* Joſephus *had ſaid, foraſmuch as no other Nations but the Egyptians, Phœnicians, and Chaldeans, have certain Records of their Original, therefore will I pretend my own Nation of the Jews to be ancienter then them, who cannot diſprove me; but becauſe the Egyptians,*

Phœnicians, and Chaldees, have more ancient Records of their Country in being; therefor to prevent being confuted, I think it more convenient to yeild to them in Antiquity. And this is the Secret meaning of what Josephus *says*].

Thus far Mr. *Blount*.

To whom I return this

ANSWER.

He that will but take some pains to read over the two Books, which *Josephus* wrote for the sake of his *Epaphroditus*, and for such as he was, lovers of Truth, in opposition to *Apion* of *Alexandria*, will soon perceive the perverseness of our Author, to exceed that of this malapert, and petulant Grammarian.

The design of *Josephus* in these two Books was to show, that *Apion*'s Negative Argument, from the silence of the Greek Authors (with respect to the Jews) was of no moment; forasmuch as the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, and Phœnecians, who had ancienter and more sure Histories; and had better ways and means of Writing, then the Greeks makemention of his Country-men the Jews: And this in effect, is the Sum of all that

Josephus

Josephus writes on this Matter, in his Books against *Apion*.

Josephus seems to make an Apology for the bragging *Greeks* in point of Antiquity, when He says, that all their Greek Writers supposed in their own behalf, that whosoever was of theirs, was the first of the World; but *Josephus* also adds (what our *Deist* omits, and alters the case) that this was for want of letters; the ancient use of which came to the Greeks from the Phœnicians and *Cadmus*; and that at that time the Greeks had no certain Records: That *Homer's Poem* was the ancientest Book which they had, and this was written after the Trojan War: Nay, that this Poem was not at first written, but was preserved by Tradition, and the People's Songs. And that this was the cause of that great Dissonancy and Difference which appeared in Original Copies, when it was first committed to Writing. It was for want of Letrers they had no ancient Histories; and that their *Cadmus Milesius*, and their *Acusilaus Argivus*, did not long precede the Expedition of the Persians against the Greeks.

Whereas nothing is, nor can be more evident to him that reads *Josephus*, than this, that the same Prejudice doth not affect

Moſes; and therefore our Author hath with great Incogitancy affirmed, that what *Joſephus* ſpeaks of the Greeks, and other Nations, may with the ſame reaſon be applied to *Moſes* and the Jews.

Our Author by this Aſſertion, overthrows his own Suppoſition; for if *Adam* and *Eve* were the firſt Man and Woman in the World, according to *Moſes*; or at leaſt muſt be ſuppoſed to be ſuch, according to our Author's Method in this place; then there could not be two Creations, one in the firſt, and another in the ſecond Chapter of *Geneſis*; there could be no Præadamites, as is pretended; and *Adam* and *Eve* were created in the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*: Which yet Mr. *Blount* can by no means allow of, without being repugnant to himſelf, and contrary to his own Method in another place.

Joſephus no where affirms, that the *Egyptians*, *Chaldeans*, and *Phenicians*, had more ancient Records than the *Jews*: He no where affirms, That he dares not compare the Writings of *Moſes* (ſo it ought to have been written, and not the Nation of the *Jews*, as I obſerved in another place) with the moſt ancient and infallible Writings (I uſe our Author's words) of the foreſaid Nations. *Joſephus*

ſephus indeed ſays, He will not enumerate the *Jews* with thoſe Barbarous Nations, with reſpect to the advantages of writing Hiſtory; but then he determines the advantage on the behalf of the *Jews:* For in that Book he plainly aſſerts, That *Moſes* was the moſt ancient of all *Legiſlators*; and that the *Jews* had a more certain way of tranſmitting their Memoirs to Poſterity, than the *Egyptians Chaldeans*, or *Phœnicians.*

That *Moſes* was a more ancient Hiſtorian than *Beroſus* the *Chaldean*, or *Manetho* the *Egyptian*, or *Sanchoniathon* the *Phenician*, is an unqueſtioned Truth, among all ſuch as know any thing of theſe matters: nothing being more evident than this, That *Beroſus* and *Manetho* lived after the time of *Alexander* the Great; and that *Sanchoniathon* wrote after the *Trojan* War.

Joſephus no where affirms, That the Writings of the forenamed Hiſtorians are infallible; he only prefers them before the *Greeks* in point of Verity and Antiquity: as for Infallibility, he allows it to no Hiſtorian but *Moſes*, whom alone he makes to be divinely inſpired. As to the point of Antiquity, we appeal to our Author himſelf, who (notwithſtanding what he hath here written of this matter) page 224. confeſſes, *That we have*

no Writer extant at this time more ancient than Moſes, *unleſs it be* Ocellus.——His exception of *Ocellus* is of no moment, as we have proved in the foregoing Diſcourſe.

After all my Search, I can no where find *Joſephus* abſolutely affirming, That the *Egyptians*, *Chaldeans*, and *Phenicians* had any certain Records of their Original; but only Comparatively with the *Greeks*: He no where affirms, directly, or indirectly, that the forenamed Nation, had more ancient Records of their Country to refute him; and that therefore he thinks more convenient, to yield to them in Antiquity: and therefore our *Deiſt* is forc'd to uſe this *Device*,——*This is the ſecret meaning of what* Joſephus *ſays.*

What *Joſephus* ſays is clear and perſpicuous: there is no colour for ſo ſlanderous an Inſinuation; and I think I may affirm witout any Calumny, or Controverſy, That not *Joſephus*, but our *Deiſt* had a *Secret meaning*, to impoſe on credulous *Readers*, by abuſing good Authors.

We may bid Farewell to all Evidence in Matters of Fact, if *Secret meanings* be allow'd of: but perhaps our *Deiſt* had herein a regard to Himſelf; hoping that at a dead lift, *This Secret meaning* might gloſs, and varniſh over ſome of his monſtrous, and incredible

Te

Tenents. I am ſure that by this *Hocus-pocus* Trick, he might have cited *The Hind and Panther* (which he quotes pag. 150.) for the Antiquities of his *Chaldeans*, *Egyptians*, *Phenicians*; and have quoted *Joſephus* for the *Frauds and Impoſings of the Prieſt*.

And now I am making towards a Concluſion; I hope I may do a thing grateful to the *Reader*, and be not thought to deviate from my Subject, if I here preſent him with the great Averſion that our Church hath for *Deiſm*.

The Church of England (*Article* 18.) *declares in theſe words*, 'They 'are alſo to be had accurſed, that 'preſume to ſay, that every Man ſhall 'be ſaved by the Law or Sect which 'he profeſſeth, ſo that he be diligent 'to frame his Life according to that 'Law, and the Light of Nature; for 'Holy Scripture doth ſet out unto us, 'only in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, 'whereby Men muſt be ſaved.

This Article plainly declares (as Mr. *Rogers* on the Articles, p. 87. collects) that the Profeſſion of every Religion cannot ſave a Man, live he never ſo vertuouſly. It alſo follows from this Article, That no Man ever was, or ſhall be ſaved, but only by the Faith and Name of *JESUS CHRIST.*

The Opinion of the *Deiſt* is diametrically oppoſite hereunto: For (pag. 199. and 200.) he affirms, That Natural and Unrevealed Religion, is ſufficient to make us happy in a future State. And he affirms (p. 201.) That this his Opinion is Charitable; foraſmuch as it doth not exclude any Diſſenters from Eternal Happineſs; and that *God* may be pleaſed with different Worſhips.

St. *Auſtin* in his Book of *Hereſies* (*cap.* 72.) reckons that of the *Rhetorians* to be one: Foraſmuch as they believe, that all hereticks hold the Truth, and walk uprightly. Which Hereſy St. *Auſtin* calls a Hereſy of wonderful vanity, and ſuch as ſeems to him incredible: my own part I cannot perceive any great difference between the *Rhetorians* and the *Deiſts*.

And whereas our *Deiſt* ſeems to value his Opinion upon the pretended Charitableneſs thereof, and thinks that a Recommendation:

He

He is much miſtaken; for this Opinion is rather *Turkiſh* than Charitable.

We read in *Busbequius* (*Epiſt.* 3.) that *Ruſtan*, the Prime *Vizier*, perſwaded that excellent Embaſſadour to turn *Muſſelman*; and that if he would do ſo, he ſhould receive great Honours and Rewards, from *Solyman* his Lord and Emperour: To whom *Busbequius* makes this Reply.

Mihi certum eſt manere in ea Religione, in qua natus eſſem quamque Dominus meus profitetur. Pulchre, inquit Ruſtanus, *ſed tamen de anima quid fiet? Et de Anima, inquam, bene ſpero. Tum ille cum pauliſper intercogitaſſet, ita eſt profecto: neque ego ab hac abſum ſententia, aternæ beatitudinis conſortes fore, qui ſanctè innocenterque hanc vitam traduxerint quamcunque illi Religionem ſecuti ſunt.* —— 'I 'am reſolved, ſays *Busbequius*, to continue 'in that *Religion* in which I were born, and 'which my Lord profeſſes: Very well, ſays '*Ruſtan*, but what will become of your Soul 'in another World? I am, ſays *Busbequius*, 'very confident of its welfare. Then *Ruſtan*, 'after ſome pauſe, makes this Anſwer, I 'am of your Mind; this is my Opinion, '*That all Perſons ſhall be eternally* 'happy, *that lead an innocent life*,

'not-

'*notwithstanding their differences in* 'Religion.

The Prime *Vizier*'s Opinion seems to me to be the same with Mr. *Blount*'s; it is altogether so charitable: And if our *Deist* had been present at that Interview, 'tis apparent enough with whom he would have sided: And if the same Offers had been made to him (which were made to that incomparable Embassadour, 'tis plain enough what he would have done. So that if I should assert, *That* Deism *is a direct Road to* Turcism, *I think I should not be mistaken.*

Our *Deist* must have more Confidence, and (all things considered) better luck than *Polus* had in *Erasmus* his Exorcisms, if he can perswade any Persons who seriously consult their own Salvation, *To behold any Happiness in his Heaven.*

It's worth our observation, in what detestation and abhorrence our *Church of England* hath the Opinion of the *Deists*; for it affixes an *Accurse to it:* which I think is not very usual for Provincial Councils.

Mr. *Pool* indeed, in his Appendix to the *Nullity of the* Romish *Faith* (pag. 240.) hath

these

theſe words: —— 'If we look into the Re-'cords of Councils, we ſhall find, That this 'Practice of *Anathematizing* was not only in 'uſe in general, but alſo in particular, and 'Provincial Councils. I doubt not but this Learned Man had good grounds for his Aſſertion: Yet I muſt confeſs for my own part, I have not obſerved this Method in Particular Councils; if we except that Orthodox Council held at *Gangra*, in *Paphlagonia*, about the Year of our Lord 324 in every one of whoſe Canons, about twenty in number, we find an *Accurſe* affix'd: a ſufficient Inſtance *In Antiquity to juſtify our* Church's *Method.*

And ſince we have had an occaſion to mention this *Synod*, and that we live in an Age, in which *Atheiſm* and *Deiſm* abounds to that degree, that the Churches ſet apart for *GOD*'s Service, and our Religious Aſſemblies, are ſlighted and contemned: I ſhall conclude with the Judment of that Pious *Synod* (Can. 5) *Si quis docet domum Dei contemptibilem eſſe ut conventus qui in ea celebrantur*, Anathema *ſit.*

How nearly this concerns our *Deiſts*, and other deſpiſers of *GOD*'s Publick Worſhip, who frequently abuſe *GOD*'s Miniſters,

and

and make no Religion of traducing and ridiculing them, is very plain and palpable: and there is here NO SECRET MEANING.

EXEQUIAS *DEISTÆ*, QUIBUS IRE COMMODUM EST JAM TEMPUS EST.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

FINIS.

Books Printed for, and Sold by Charles Yeo, John Pearce, *and* Philip Biſhop, *Bookſellers in* Exon.

SElect Hymns, each fitted to two Tunes, to be ſung in Churches.

The Beauty of Holineſs: or, a ſhort Defence and Vindication of the pious Decency, Regularity, and Order, of Reading the Communion-Service, at the Communion-Table; offered to a diſſatisfied Neighbour, from his Miniſter.

A Form of Prayer for Married Perſons, for the moſt part taken out of the Liturgy.

In the PRESS.

A Practical Treatiſe concerning Evil Thoughts; wherein are ſome Things more eſpecially uſeful for Melancholy Perſons. By *William Chilcot*, M. A.

Dammonii Orientales Illuſtres: or, the Worthies of *Devon*; Printed by way of Subſcription, Price in Sheets Sixteen Shillings and Six Pence; the firſt Payment Eight Shillings. All Gentlemen that are willing to take the Advantage by Subſcribing, are deſired to ſend in their firſt Payment with all ſpeed to the Undertakers, *Charles Yeo*, *John Pearce* and *Philip Biſhop*.